

VAFANISYEV

**SOCIALISM  
AND  
COMMUNISM**

Translated from the Russian by *J. Gibbons*  
Designed by *V. Kuleshov*

В. Афанасьев  
СОЦИАЛИЗМ И КОММУНИЗМ  
На английском языке

First printing 1972

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Chapter One</b>	
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM . . . . .	5
1. The Historical Inevitability of Socialism . . . . .	5
2. Leninism—the Creative Development of the Science of Socialism and Communism . . . . .	14
3. The Twilight of World Capitalism . . . . .	24
<b>Chapter Two</b>	
OUR ERA—THE ERA OF THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM . . . . .	34
1. The Basic Content of the Present Epoch . . . . .	34
2. The Socialist System Is Becoming the Decisive Factor in World Development . . . . .	40
3. The Revolutionary Working-Class Movement in the Capitalist Countries . . . . .	52
4. The Communist Movement Today . . . . .	58
5. The National Liberation Movement . . . . .	64
<b>Chapter Three</b>	
THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM . . . . .	78
1. The General Laws and the Specific Forms of Building Socialism . . . . .	78
2. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Leading Role of the Communist Party Are Decisive for Building Socialism . . . . .	80
3. Economic Transformations . . . . .	85
4. Restructuring National Relationships . . . . .	94
5. The Cultural Revolution . . . . .	96
<b>Chapter Four</b>	
SOCIALISM—THE INITIAL PHASE OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY . . . . .	101
1. The Economy of Socialism . . . . .	103
2. The Class Structure of Socialist Society and Its Political Organisation . . . . .	108
3. Socialism and Its Culture . . . . .	116
4. Socialism and the Individual . . . . .	119

## Chapter Five

COMMUNISM—THE HIGHER PHASE OF THE NEW SOCIETY . . . . .	122
1. The Main Features of the Future Society . . . . .	122
2. The Individual Under Communism . . . . .	133

## Chapter Six

BUILDING COMMUNISM IN THE USSR . . . . .	138
1. The Material and Technological Base of Communism . . . . .	138
2. From Socialist to Communist Relationships . . . . .	150
3. Moulding the New Man . . . . .	168
4. Communism—Man's Future . . . . .	180

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE SCIENCE OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

*The theory of scientific socialism is a component of Marxism-Leninism. This science, which proves the historical inevitability of the supersession of capitalist society by the new, socialist, society, had for its founders Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.*

#### 1. The Historical Inevitability of Socialism

**Marx and Engels—  
Founders of the  
Science of Socialism  
and Communism**

Over the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries, in a number of countries of Western Europe feudalism yielded place to capitalism—a consequence of the beginnings of machine production, which in turn led to a rapid development of industry, technology and natural science. The workshops of the handicraftsmen and the guilds made way for factories, mines and ore-workings; human muscle and the energy supplied by water and wind were replaced by the energy of steam and, later, electricity. During this relatively brief space of time—a matter of two or three centuries—capitalism brought about an economic progress far greater than anything seen in the whole of man's previous history. Capitalism, however, did little to ease the burden of the toiler, for capitalist exploitation replaced slave and feudal exploitation, and all the more so because in a whole number of capitalist countries there remained hangovers of feudalism, with capitalist oppression being often supplemented by that of feudalism. One

result of this was a growing discontent among the working people, a sharpening class struggle, that is conflict between the factory owners and their wage labourers lacking means of production. This change in the social environment could not but be reflected in the spiritual life of society. The first utopian writings about socialism made their appearance, in which the protest of the people against the existing social system found expression. The writings of the utopians, devastating in their criticism of capitalist society, called for its replacement by a new system of socialism, communism. While conceptions of this new society remained hazy and lacked coherence, the early utopian writers firmly believed that it would be a system without private ownership and human exploitation, a system in which all would have equal rights and equal obligations. But it is precisely here that we observe the utopian immaturity of the pioneering socialist writers: they were unable to provide a sound, scientifically substantiated answer to the questions as to how and by what means capitalism could be abolished, what social force would put an end to capitalism and inaugurate the new society. Varying viewpoints were advanced. Some held that all that was needed was to request the propertied classes to relinquish their property, their power and their privileges in favour of the majority and that by granting this request capitalism would yield to socialism. Others believed that the new society would come about as the result of education and the spread of enlightenment. Still others projected schemes for "communist colonies" and they actually organised such colonies. But these ideas and schemes were, clearly, not feasible; their utopianism and immaturity were less the fault than the misfortune of their authors. For in those days the conditions needed for the rise of the new society and, in equal measure, for the birth of the science of socialism and communism were still in the womb of time. The immaturity of the theories about socialism, understandably, corresponded to the immaturity of society.

The science of socialism and communism was worked out by *Karl Marx* (1818-1883) and *Frederick Engels* (1820-1895). Their scientific and revolutionary activity began in Germany in the eighteen-forties. For capitalism, now firmly established in a series of countries in Europe and

North America, this was a time of rapid growth, of the rise of a new class—the industrial proletariat—and its entry into revolutionary struggle.

It seemed at the time that there would be no end to the reign of the bourgeoisie. But this was just the appearance. The reality was different. In 1848 there rang out the clarion call of the *Communist Manifesto* in which Marx and Engels showed that capitalist society, based on private ownership and exploitation, would, with the same inevitability that capitalism had superceded feudalism, be replaced by a society without exploitation and slavery, by communist society, that mankind was advancing towards the grand communist revolution. "Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution," declared Marx and Engels. The era of utopian socialism had ended, the era of scientific socialism had begun.

As distinct from utopian socialism and its unsubstantiated assumptions and wishful thinking, the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels was *firmly based on the study of the reality of capitalism and on a scientific understanding of the laws governing the development of society.*

**The Theoretical Basis of Scientific Socialism** One of the truly great services rendered by Marx and Engels was their establishment of *the materialist conception of history*. Whereas previously social scientists had adhered to the opinion that the march of history was determined by ideas, by the views held by people, Marx and Engels based themselves on the fact that before men engage in politics, philosophy and art, that is, in intellectual labours, they must have at their disposal the necessary minimum of material things (food, clothing and shelter). But in order to obtain these things people must work and produce. And it is this *labour activity of the people and their production of material things that provide the basis for social development*. This discovery showed that history, far from being an accumulation of fortuities, *was a law-governed, natural and requisite process of the replacing of one social system by another, by a higher and better system, and that this process rested on the advance of material production*. Primitive society had given way to slave-owning society, slavery to feudalism, and the latter to capitalism.

But that being so, and since the development of society

is a law-governed process of the replacing of one socio-economic formation by another, it follows that capitalist society must, with the same inevitability, make way for the new socialist society.

Of great significance for Marx's scientific substantiation of socialism was his discovery of *surplus value*—the source of capitalist profit and of capitalist exploitation. The worker in capitalist society, deprived of the basic means of production (factories, machinery and means of transport), owns only his labour power, his ability to work and produce material values. In order to live and to provide for his family he is obliged to appear before the owner of the means of production—the capitalist—and offer his labour power for sale.

A bargain is struck between worker and capitalist, with the former selling his labour power and the latter buying it; the worker works and the capitalist pays him wages. Penetrating into the essence of this bargain, Marx showed that it is far from being equal, as it would seem at first glance. The point is that labour power is a commodity of a special kind, a commodity capable of producing material values. What is more, the values it creates are greater than the wages paid to its seller by the capitalist. The latter pays only for part of the values produced by the worker, he appropriates the remainder. And it is here that we find the essence of capitalist exploitation.

Clearly, the workers cannot become reconciled to this state of affairs. They engage in conflict with their enslaver—the capitalist. And this class conflict between workers and capitalists flows of necessity from the irreconcilability of the economic and political status of the two classes in society, from the understandable striving of the workers to change this state of affairs, to get rid of the exploitation and to assert their rule in society. The right to this rule is theirs by virtue of their being producers of all material values.

Capitalism, which brought about a rapid expansion of the forces of production, established in a number of countries large-scale machine production and furthered the progress of education and science. It did away with feudal disunity and seclusion and replaced these with a world-wide economy.

In fact it extended the system of capitalist exploitation to the ends of the earth, making it especially brutal and destructive for the majority of the peoples and, by force of arms, turned them into colonial slaves.

This rapid growth of production was stimulated by the *drive for profits* and by *competition*. In the chase for profits and in the striving to triumph over his competitors on the market, the capitalist expands his production, installs newer and better machines and improves the technology of industry and agriculture. But in the main the output of this capitalist production finds its way in the shape of profits into the coffers of the capitalists who own the basic means of production. As for the overwhelming majority of the people in society, that is those who work in factory and on field—those who produce values in immense quantities—they often lack the bare necessities. Output grows and increases but the purchasing power of the vast majority of the population does not keep pace with growth of production, this resulting in an incomplete utilisation of production capacity, in crises of over-production, in economic recessions and in large-scale unemployment.

Capitalism, therefore, reveals its deep-going contradiction—the contradiction between the social character of the process of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation. Under capitalism, production bears a clearly expressed social character in which millions of working people concentrated in giant enterprises take part, while the fruits of their labour are appropriated by a small group of big industrialists. Take, for example, the automobile industry. The making of an automobile presupposes the use of metal derived from ore-mining. So that in the making of the automobile there take part the miners who mine the ore, and the metal-workers who turn the ore into metal. Thousands more work on the numerous details which go into the automobile, details which find their way to the conveyor for assembly. Nor is that all. The making of the automobile presupposes also electric power, factory buildings, means of transport and communications and many, many more items. Production of an automobile, then, necessitates the labour also of power workers, and transport and communication workers. In other words, vast numbers of people take part in the making of the automobile. And

**The Socialist Revolution  
as the Lever  
for Replacing  
Capitalism by Socialism**

education and science. It did away with feudal disunity and seclusion and replaced these with a world-wide economy.

the moment the car comes off the line it is sold, with a considerable part of the money received for it appropriated by the owner of the plant—by the individual capitalist or a small group of capitalists—which, clearly, is unjust. This injustice can be removed only in one way—by abolishing private ownership and exploitation and replacing them by public ownership of the means of production; on this foundation a community of the people of labour could be established and justice brought into the process of distribution: the wealth rightfully belongs to those who create it, to those who work. He who does not work neither shall he eat.

It is common knowledge, however, that the capitalists will never voluntarily relinquish the means of production, ownership of which enables them to exploit the labour of the people, will never voluntarily relinquish their privileges or their dominant position in society. There is but one way in which private ownership and exploitation can be abolished, and that is by *the class struggle of the working people against the bourgeoisie, the highest form and culmination of which is the socialist revolution*. The socialist revolution puts an end to the rule of the bourgeoisie, establishes the rule of the working class and of all working people and paves the way to the new society of socialism.

The socialist revolution, then, has its definite economic source in the contradiction in capitalist production; it is a historically necessary act. And this necessity arises from the developmental needs of production, needs seeking to burst out from the restrictive capitalist framework and whose social nature necessitates the abolition of private capitalist ownership and the affirmation of social, collective ownership.

Thus, the materialist conception of history, the analysis of the objective laws of social development and the contradictions inherent in this development brought Marx and Engels to the theory of the socialist revolution as the *necessary and sole* way to replace capitalism by socialism, the necessary precondition for the emancipation of the man of labour, clearing the way for his free and genuinely human existence.

#### The Historic Mission of the Working Class

Marx and Engels did more than point to the socialist revolution as the sole way to abolish capitalism and establish socialism. They pointed, too, to the social force which alone is capable of carrying out this revolution. *This force is the working class. To emancipate itself and all working people by means of the socialist revolution, to abolish capitalism and inaugurate a genuinely human society—socialism—such is the grand historic mission of the working class.* "The chief thing in the doctrine of Marx," wrote Lenin, "is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society."<sup>1</sup>

The first and fundamental task of the socialist revolution is the overthrow of capitalist rule, the destruction of the old machinery of state and the establishment of a new state—the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The power in this state is in the hands of the working people themselves headed by the industrial working class.

Why, then, did Marx and Engels arrive at the conclusion that precisely to the working class belongs the grand mission of emancipating the man of labour and all humanity?

They did so because the working class is *the most revolutionary class in capitalist society. Not owning any means of production, it is the most exploited class* under capitalism. It is compelled to work for the capitalist, to be the object of capitalist exploitation. Not only the working class, but also the peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie, too, are exploited in capitalist society. But, as distinct from the worker, both the peasant and the urban small bourgeois own property, instruments and means of labour, factors which to a degree bring them into kinship with the capitalists and it is this that explains their political instability and their wavering. As concerns the worker, his sole possessions are his working hands and his ability to work. Hence he and his family are dependent on the blind play of circumstances, on whether there is a demand for his labour.

And for this very reason the working class, much more than any other class in society, is interested in abolishing private ownership and exploitation, and this means that it

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 582.

is also the most revolutionary and the most irreconcilable class to capitalism. The socialist revolution is called upon to abolish capitalism and to establish socialism—the vital cause of the working class and its cherished dream. In revolution it has nothing to lose but its chains and, having cast them off it gains the whole world, the means of production and political power and, with them, also the right to benefit from all the achievements of material and intellectual culture.

The working class is the most revolutionary class also because of its association with a *progressive form of running the economy—large-scale machine production*. With this form of production lies the future and, consequently, the working class is linked with the future of all mankind. Behind the working class lies the strength of the masses, the strength of the most numerous class in capitalist society.

But that is not all. The very conditions of capitalist production make the working class the best *organised* and the most *disciplined* class in society. Having brought large-scale industry into existence, the capitalists concentrated workers in the cities, in giant factories and mills. These workers form large labour collectives and for this reason, when joining in struggle with the capitalists, they quickly learn the need for organisation and strict discipline. They realise that the conditions in which they work and live are utterly oppressive, that everywhere they are confronted with one and the same exploiter—the capitalist. This, too, is a source of the beginnings of a class consciousness and of its development, of the urge to unite not only at the point of production but also on a national scale and, later, on the international plane. The working class forms its own organisations—trade unions, co-operatives, insurance clubs and ultimately, the political party which guides its struggle.

The conditions of its life and work make it easier for the working class to grasp the advanced revolutionary ideas and to assimilate the advanced theory. True, the majority of workers have neither the time, means nor the knowledge that would enable them to develop this theory. Hence the task of bringing to the working class knowledge of socialism and of combining socialism with the working-class movement. This vital task is fulfilled by the political party

of the working class which contains the advanced men and women of that class and also those intellectuals who have sided with the working class and who uphold its interests.

This is why we speak of the *revolutionary Marxist party* which alone is capable of bringing the ideas of scientific socialism to the working class, of organising it for the fight against capitalism and of leading this fight, for resolute action against capitalist ideology and other auxiliaries of the bourgeoisie.

Affirmation of the leading role of this party and of the working class in the socialist revolution and in building socialism is one of the fundamentals of Marxism, of the theory of scientific socialism.

In battling for its ideals the working class is not alone. Other classes and social groups suffering from exploitation join with it in a close alliance; these include the peasantry, handicraftsmen, the urban petty bourgeoisie and working intellectuals. Marx and Engels and, later, Lenin attached special importance to the *alliance of the working class and peasantry* who form the majority of the nation. In this alliance they saw the social force that would carry out the revolution and, upon doing so, begin to build socialism. By emancipating itself from capitalist slavery the working class simultaneously emancipates all working people, the whole of society, from oppression.

It should be emphasised that the class struggle of the workers, not being confined within the national boundaries, acquires an *international character*. The working class has no interest in discord and enmity between the nations. Against the capitalists united on a world scale the working class advances its international unity, joint struggle by the peoples against the society of private ownership and exploitation. Proof of this, for example, was the international support extended by the workers of France, Britain and other countries to the Russian workers at the time of the October Socialist Revolution. The mass movement that raised the slogan "Hands off Soviet Russia!" was for the working people of the young Soviet Republic tremendous moral and political support and contributed to their victory over the internal counter-revolution and the foreign intervention.

## 2. Leninism—the Creative Development of the Science of Socialism and Communism

### The Triumph of Lenin's Ideas

Marx and Engels lived and fought at a time when capitalism was on the ascent, when the development of society proceeded relatively slowly and peacefully. However, by the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth century radical changes began to take place. Capitalism was approaching its final phase—the phase of imperialism.

Imperialism, as Lenin pointed out, is characterised by a number of features, chief of which is domination by the *monopolies* (large industrial amalgamations) which have replaced the previous free competition. Typical for imperialism is the fusion of finance and industrial capital and the rise of a financial oligarchy; the main export now is capital, not goods, which was the feature of the pre-monopoly phase of capitalism; keen rivalry for the economic and territorial division and redivision of the world now set in.

The economic and political contradictions of capitalism were sharpened to the extreme in the imperialist phase. The era of peaceful growth now yielded to the era of social conflict and revolutionary upheavals.

The onset of this radical break in social relationships coincided in time approximately with man's entry into the era of a *new scientific and technological revolution*, with such remarkable achievements as the discovery of atomic energy and its utilisation, space research, automation, electronics, rocket technology and the new developments in industrial chemistry. In their totality these developments have posed the question of the historical untenability of the capitalist system which, as we have seen, not infrequently uses science and technology not for the good of the people but to their detriment, as instruments of exploitation and aggression. Contemporary capitalism, or imperialism, now more than ever before, acts as a brake on social and technological progress, so much so that the historical necessity of replacing capitalism by socialism becomes increasingly insistent.

It goes without saying that the new conditions called for a new approach to the cardinal social problems, for creative development of the science of socialism. The need now was to summarise the new experience of the revolutionary movement of the working class, the experience of the national liberation and democratic movements and the achievements in science and technology. This is all the more important because in the new conditions the forces inimical to Marxism became much more active. The naked attacks on Marxism, on the theory of scientific communism, by the ideologues of the bourgeois classes objectively fused with the attacks launched by the opportunists in the working-class movement in their effort to undermine it from within on the pretext of developing Marxism and bringing it up to date.

Consequently, history and the entire process of man's development in the new era confronted social science with a task of overriding importance: *to uphold the gains of Marxism, to develop it creatively and to supply the answers to the burning questions of the day*. And in the person of *Uladimir Ilyich Lenin* (1870-1924) science coped with this pressing demand of the times.

Lenin, who took over the torch from Marx and Engels, a brilliant thinker and ardent revolutionary, was the leader of the Russian workers and of the international working class.

Associated with his name is the brightest chapter in the history of Marxism, a chapter which provided the answers to the vital questions posed by life, which fully and faithfully reflected the urgent needs of the time, the needs of historical progress.

Linked with Lenin is the founding of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the party of profound theoretical thought and revolutionary action, the party of the founders and builders of the new society.

With Lenin's name is linked one of the greatest turning points in history—the Great October Socialist Revolution which ushered in the new era, the era of man's transition from capitalism to socialism.

Associated with Lenin's name is the founding of the world's first socialist state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which is now the centre of attraction for all the

revolutionary and progressive forces of the day and the embodiment of man's cherished aspirations.

Also linked with Lenin's name are the successes of the forces of world socialism, the battles fought and the victories won by the working people over capitalism, the successes of the oppressed peoples and their unrelenting struggle against colonialism.

Lenin's name has become the symbol of proletarian revolutions, of socialism and progress, the symbol of the communist reconstruction of the world. With every justification it can be said that in our time mankind lives, moves and develops in the Leninist way. *Leninism is the Marxism of the twentieth century, of our era, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of man's transition from capitalism to socialism, the era of building the communist society.*

"All the experience of world socialism and of the working-class and national liberation movements," says the Address of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow on the occasion of the Lenin centenary, "has confirmed world significance of Marxist-Leninist teaching. The victory of the socialist revolution in a group of countries, the emergence of the world socialist system, the gains of the working-class movement in capitalist countries, the appearance of peoples of former colonies and semi-colonies in the arena of socio-political development as independent agents, and the unprecedented upsurge of the struggle against imperialism—all this is proof that Leninism is historically correct and expresses the fundamental needs of the modern age."<sup>1</sup>

**The Development  
of the Theory of  
Socialist Revolution  
by Lenin**

Without the slightest hesitation it can be said that Lenin developed literally all aspects of Marx's teaching on socialism and communism. Lenin's historical service is that his theoretical work was organically linked with the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and with the practice of building socialism in the USSR. Not only did he enrich and advance the science of socialism and communism, he guided the

actual realisation of its principles. Lenin masterminded the plan for building socialism and communism in the land of the Soviets, and to the end of his days stood at the head of the people and the Party in the practical realisation of this plan.

The new era in history placed before the working class and its Marxist party the immediate task of the revolutionary reconstruction of society, the abolition of capitalism and the building of socialism. This explains why Lenin devoted much attention to the laws of social development and, above all, to the essence of imperialism, to analysis of the antagonisms rending imperialism and to elaborating ways and means for their resolution by the revolutionary forces headed by the working class.

A special place in Lenin's writings is held by the theory of the socialist revolution, a theory which has greatly influenced the further development of society, the course of world history.

What, then, are the basic features of Lenin's theory of revolution?

First, Lenin defined the place of imperialism in history, showed that it was a dying capitalism. The basic contradiction of capitalism, that between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation, reaches its sharpest point in the conditions of imperialism. Imperialism, Lenin wrote, "leads directly to the most comprehensive socialisation of production", but while doing so it preserves the private ownership principle of distribution; "private economic and private property relations constitute a shell which no longer fits its contents, a shell which must inevitably decay . . . , but which will inevitably be removed".<sup>1</sup> *Imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution.* In the conditions of imperialism, the socialist revolution is more than possible, it is both *necessary* and *inevitable*; it confronts the working class as the immediate task of the day.

A vital link in Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution was his brilliant discovery of the possibility of socialism being victorious *at first in one country taken singly*. This thesis differs greatly from the view expressed by Marx to the effect that socialism would be victorious in all civilised

<sup>1</sup> *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 41.*

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 205, 303.

countries or at any rate in the majority of them. Marx, however, lived at the time of *pre-monopoly capitalism*, when the capitalist countries developed more or less evenly and along ascending lines, when their contradictions were not nearly so profound as those of imperialism. From this he drew the conclusion that any attempt by the working class of one or another country to overthrow capitalist rule would be countered by the combined organised resistance of the capitalists of many countries and, inevitably, would be crushed. Capitalism, Marx held, could be abolished only by the combined efforts of the workers in all or, at any rate, in the majority of countries.

Lenin showed that things were different in the *imperialist* phase. Here as never before we see extremely uneven leaps in the development of the different countries. Some of them, previously lagging, catch up with and overtake in the economic and political aspects the hitherto leading countries. A change takes place in the balance of forces, conflicts arise and, with them, a weakening of the solid front of the capitalist countries. The outcome is a weakening of capitalism on a world scale and the possibility of breaking the imperialist chain at its weakest link.

"The development of capitalism," wrote Lenin, "proceeds extremely unevenly in different countries. It cannot be otherwise under commodity production. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois."<sup>1</sup>

Having pointed to the possibility of socialism being successful at first in one country, Lenin foresaw also the path of the further development of the socialist revolution on a world scale: a succession of more and more countries parting with imperialism, with others still remaining capitalist or pre-capitalist. Lenin conceived man's transition from capitalism to socialism not as a single act but as embracing *an entire historical epoch*.

In developing the Marxist theory of the socialist revolution, Lenin took into account the exceedingly complex

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 79.

picture of the world of his day: the existence not only of capitalist but also of countries at the pre-capitalist stage, including colonies in which the tasks of a bourgeois-democratic nature had yet to be completed; the existence in each country of the most varied classes and social groups. From this he drew the conclusion that in the era of imperialism there could be no such thing as "pure" socialist revolutions. It would be wrong to imagine, Lenin wrote, that "one army lines up in one place and says, 'We are for socialism', and another, somewhere else and says, 'We are for imperialism', and that will be a social revolution! ... Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip-service to revolution without understanding what revolution is..."<sup>1</sup> Lenin envisaged the revolutionary process as "an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry oppressed and discontented elements".<sup>2</sup> This process embraces the workers' movement, the peasant movement, the national liberation movement and various kinds of democratic movements against imperialism.

Lenin, who stressed the necessity of a firm alliance of the working class with all the revolutionary forces against imperialism, always denounced sectarianism and spoke against isolating the working class from the other working people and democratic forces. Lenin had in mind not just an alliance in general, but an alliance in which *the vanguard role would be played by the working class*, which he regarded as the main revolutionary force.

Generally speaking, Lenin never held that a revolutionary outburst in one or another country was bound to be socialist and bound to lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the colonies and in countries with pronounced relics of feudalism and also in those countries where the bourgeois-democratic transformations had yet to be carried out, the socialist revolution would in all likelihood be preceded by a bourgeois-democratic or a national liberation revolution which, given the right conditions, could grow into a socialist revolution. He also expressed the view that

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 356.

countries still in the pre-capitalist phase (chiefly colonies or until recently dependent countries) might be able to bypass capitalism and turn directly to socialism (the so-called *non-capitalist way*). But needed for this, however, was the dictatorship of the proletariat in other countries.

Lenin was the founder of a new kind of party, the revolutionary Communist Party. The Party, being the vanguard of the working class and its most conscious and organised unit, organises and rallies this class, equips it with the advanced revolutionary theory and with the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement. Under the leadership of the Party of Communists the workers and peasants of Russia overthrew capitalism and established the first socialist state in the world.

Leninism, an  
International Teaching

Leninism was given to advanced social thought of mankind by Russia, which certainly was not among the highly developed capitalist countries. This was not accidental, nor was it any "cunning" on the part of history. It was rather a historical necessity because it was precisely in Russia at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth that conditions had set in favouring the socialist revolution, the cause to which Marx devoted his brilliant mind, his immense creative powers and organising skill.

Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and especially at the beginning of the twentieth, Russian industry showed a pronounced growth. During the five years, from 1909 to 1913, the value of industrial output rose by 54 per cent. This expansion went hand in hand with the growing concentration of production. In 1914, enterprises employing 500 workers and upwards accounted for 56.5 per cent of the total employed. And although Russia still remained primarily an agrarian country, it occupied one of the leading places in the world for the degree of concentration in industry. Industrialisation was accompanied by an intensive process of monopolisation, concentration of bank capital and fusion of bank and industrial capital. In other words, the processes taking place in Russia were similar to those in the Western capitalist countries. These processes were typical for the imperialist phase of world capitalism.

Another feature was the intertwining of the interests of

Russian and international imperialism: a considerable part of the finance capital in Russia was controlled by foreign banks. Foreigners owned 42 per cent of the share capital controlled by the leading Russian banks. At the time of the outbreak of the First World War, Russia's foreign debt amounted to the astronomical sum of 5,900 million rubles. Russia was enmeshed in a web of extortionate treaties and agreements which placed her not only in economic but also in political dependence of foreign imperialists. In foreign policy she adhered to an Anglo-French orientation.

And so, with Russia being a link in the world system of imperialism, the struggle of the Russian working people against imperialism and the autocracy could not but acquire the character of an international struggle against world capital.

In the wake of the industrialisation came the formation of a working class of which the industrial workers formed the core. Their numbers employed in the enterprises under the supervision of factory inspectors grew in four years, 1909-13, by 30.8 per cent. The Russian working class was subjected to a degree of exploitation not seen in any other country. Real wages in industry in 1913 had declined by 10 per cent compared with 1900, whereas the profits of the capitalists for the same period had increased threefold. The Russian workers, who had taken over the finest traditions of the emancipation movement in the country, passed through the grim school of struggle against the autocracy and capital, acquired valuable experience of class struggle and the experience of the 1905-07 revolution. This working class was headed by the new kind of revolutionary party founded by Lenin, a party of internationalists. In its working class and in this party Russia acquired a leading social force capable of destroying imperialism on Russian soil and, by so doing, struck a powerful blow against the forces of world imperialism.

The brutal exploitation of the factory workers, the land hunger and poverty of the peasants, the absence of all political rights, the oppression of the national minorities, the feudal and patriarchal relics, the dependence on foreign capital, all tended to make Russia a focal point of social and national oppression, a focal point of the contradictions of world imperialism. These contradictions were accentuat-

ed by the outbreak of the world war which brought upon the people still greater misery and suffering.

By encouraging the masses to fight against Russian capitalism, the Leninist Party channelled into a single revolutionary stream the socialist movement of the working class, the peasant and the national liberation movements and the public action against the war. In a word, *Russia had become the centre of the world-wide revolutionary movement.*

Russia was now in the van of historical progress precisely because she was the focal point of all the contradictions of imperialism and, for this reason, was also its weakest link. These contradictions had become so acute that the socialist revolution was now on the agenda of the day.

The strength of Lenin was not simply that he revealed the true picture of Russia's development, it was chiefly that he was able to grasp the overall trend in the world in the imperialist epoch and to sense the vital needs of the working class and all working people everywhere.

Perceiving imperialism as an international phenomenon, Lenin showed that it was that social system which, by virtue of historical necessity, would be succeeded by a new society without exploitation and social oppression, a society that would be a community of the people of labour—a socialist society. And no matter what cunning and craft the enemies of progress resort to, no matter how they try to put a sprag in the wheel of history, human history, pursuing the tenor of its way, reveals the untenability of all the attempts to arrest its natural development.

Lenin was the leader not only of the Russian but also of the international working class, of the working people everywhere. He displayed the keenest interest in the international communist movement which he founded and led. He was the founding father of the Third, Communist International, successor to the Second International whose leaders, floundering in the swamp of opportunism, had betrayed the working class. Denouncing opportunism, Lenin stressed the international character of the communist movement and tried to rally the communist forces on an international scale. "Capital," he wrote, "is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed.

"We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists."<sup>1</sup>

The inaugural congress of the Third International, which played an outstanding role in the development of the world communist movement, took place in Moscow at the beginning of March 1919. The new International united the Communists of the world on the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism, worked out the strategy and tactics of the workers' movement in the new historical conditions, helped in establishing and developing the young Communist Parties, enriching them with revolutionary experience, waged unceasing struggle against opportunism of all hues, exercised the outmost effect on the national liberation movement, the fight of the masses for democracy and headed the actions of the peoples for peace.

Lenin elaborated the theory of the modern revolutionary process embracing not only those forces presently engaged in building socialism, the revolutionary movement of the working class, but also the national liberation movement and other democratic movements opposed to imperialism. The basic strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the working class and of the world communist movement, elaborated by Lenin in keeping with the specific revolutionary process of the new era, retain their validity to this day.

Lenin laid the foundation for the friendship of the numerous peoples of the USSR—a friendship which is one of the greatest gains of socialism and a bulwark of its might. He consistently combated nationalism, whether Russian, German or Chinese nationalism. In the very first days of Soviet rule the Government proclaimed The Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, which marked the beginning of a new era in the relations between nations. In place of the cult of violence, imperialist plunder, robbery and oppression of peoples typical of capitalism, the new principles of international relationships appeared—respect for the sovereignty and inviolability of big and small nations and non-interference in their internal affairs.

Lenin drafted the programme for solving the national question—one of the most complex and nettlesome issues of social life, and he guided its realisation. Russia, which

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 359.

under tsardom had acquired unenviable fame as the prison-house of the peoples, has become, thanks to socialism, a grand community of free and highly developed nations. This Leninist friendship of the peoples of the USSR is the living embodiment of proletarian internationalism.

### 3. The Twilight of World Capitalism

The adversaries of Marxism-Leninism, of scientific socialism argue that the views of Marx and Engels have become outdated. These views, they allege, were all right for the nineteenth century (in Marx's lifetime), and for the beginning of the twentieth century (the time of Lenin), but now, in the second half of the twentieth century, when a radically changed capitalism has become "people's capitalism", the affluent "consumer society", without social antagonisms and conflicts, these views are "no longer valid". In the new conditions the working class, according to the theorists of the bourgeoisie and their auxiliaries, should be thinking in terms of scientific and technological progress, production growth and greater productivity of labour. Talk about a socialist revolution, they say, is old hat, since what is needed is not a revolution in the forms of property and political relationships but a revolution in the sphere of technology, and, they go on, it is precisely this revolution that is taking place in the West.

Is this really the case? Let's take a closer look at capitalism in the nineteen-seventies.

#### State-monopoly Capitalism

The first thing to notice about it is that present-day capitalism, imperialism, is above all *state-monopoly capitalism*. The monopoly bourgeoisie seeks to keep abreast of the new developments in the sphere of the productive forces, of the current scientific and technological revolution; it is extremely worried about the class struggle now being fought out on a world scale, about the progress of the socialist countries and their struggle against the capitalist world system.

In capitalist society, the market and the laws of competition have always been, and remain, the sole regulators of the economy. However, the change from pre-monopoly to monopoly capitalism and the onset of the general crisis of

capitalism have led to a situation in which these regulators are no longer adequate, with the result that the monopolies invoked direct intervention by the state in the sphere of production. Herein we have one of the basic reasons, the economic reason, for the appearance of state-monopoly capitalism, in which *the economic power of the monopolies fuses with the political power of the state*. Of course, this is not the only reason, just as the intervention in production is not the sole function of the combined forces of the monopolies and the state. The purpose of the merger is to enrich the monopolies, to suppress the working-class movement and the national liberation struggle, to salvage capitalism and engage in aggressive wars. And realisation of this purpose presupposes the main thing in capitalism—its economy based on private ownership.

The capitalist state performs its *regulator-programmic* role chiefly in the public sector—the state-owned industry resulting from the capitalist nationalisation which can be described as joint ownership by the monopolies. The direct leadership of all the enterprises and industries in the public sector is exercised by the state.

And one of its main cares is to eliminate, if only in part, the manifestations of capitalism's general crisis, and especially its crises of over-production. The state's anti-crisis measures include among other things the following: considerable state orders, especially orders for military purposes; artificial restriction of consumer-goods output with a view to making less goods available for the market; financial backing for the monopolies, especially in the shape of grants to those in financial difficulties via non-repayable subsidies; and the building-up of excess reserve stocks through state purchasing of the excess production of the monopolies. The burden of these measures is borne chiefly by the working population, that is by the taxpayers who provide the bulk of budget revenue which is used by the state to finance the anti-crisis measures.

The government also coordinates its programmes of capital investments and those of private firms, allocates orders and materials in short supply, regulates its prices and tax policies—much to the benefit of the monopolies—and also redistributes the national income by granting them credits and subsidies for modernisation of plant. With

growing frequency the capitalist state acts as the initiator in developing new branches of industry, chiefly those associated with the new technology; it takes upon itself the investment risk in those branches in the initial phase, a phase which from the standpoint of profit holds no great attraction for the private monopolies, and it exercises supervisory control over war production and the main research centres. This state-monopoly regulation is dictated by the requirements of modern production, science and technology. The revolution in these spheres presupposes a greater degree of concentration in production, a combination of material, financial and human resources, and a much greater scale of research. The development of all this is often impossible without state aid to the private monopolies. Not least of the factors providing a stimulus to the state-monopoly regulation is the socialist world's economic challenge to capitalism. To hold its own in the economic competition between the two systems the capitalist state engages in a search for measures likely to activate production and accelerate growth.

But considerable though the role of the state regulation is, it does not change the essence of imperialism, does not end the exploitation, nor does it eliminate the market fever, the competitive struggle and the anarchy encountered in production.

Proof of this is afforded by the post-war crises of over-production in the United States, the recurring currency crises, inflation and the ever-rising prices in a whole number of capitalist countries, by the trade and payments balance crises, stock exchange failures and the numerous bankruptcies, the flow of gold from the United States, and so on. Nor has the regulation put an end to the chronic under-working production capacities, to unemployment; it has failed to ensure stable growth rates. For example, the growth rate in United States industry in 1970 compared with the previous year declined by 3 per cent, and in 1969 it rose by 7 per cent; for Britain the corresponding figures are 2 and 1, for France 8 and 14, and for Federal Germany 6 and 12 per cent.

The state-monopoly economic regulation is accompanied by *social regulation*. Special attention is devoted to regulating labour-capital relations, regulation which, understand-

ably, always favours the capitalists. In its social regulation the capitalist state seeks to overcome, within the capitalist framework, the irreconcilable contradiction between capital and labour and thus to maintain the system of exploitation. At times it is obliged to curb the over-eagerness of the monopolies, compelling them to grant some concessions to the workers with the aim of smoothing over particular conflicts. A favourite resort is social demagoguery which, however, does not prevent it from exerting economic pressure on the working class and also other pressures ranging from the ideological to the use of troops, police and the courts.

State-monopoly capitalism, it should be said, complicates and hampers the revolutionary struggle of the working class, since it confronts the latter with the combined strength of the monopolies and the state. But then the nationalisation, the establishment of a public sector, the programming in the economic and other spheres—all, of course, reflecting the monopoly interests and their economic and political strategy—are nevertheless clear proof that as an economic and political system capitalism has outlived its day. Ever more insistently socialism is knocking on the doors of the capitalist world; the requirements of the modern economy compel the bourgeoisie to retreat somewhat from the divine "right of private ownership", to set up a public sector operating with its own programmes. And while this economy does not cease to be capitalist, the mere fact of its existence shows quite clearly that, as organisers and managers of production, the capitalists are now superfluous, that they are parasites on the body of society. Moreover, "a state-owned economy" is the immediate stepping stone to socialism, since it can easily become socialist property as a result of the socialist revolution.

Economic and social regulation, then, cannot solve the contradictions of modern capitalism, especially the contradiction between labour and capital. On the contrary, as time goes on these contradictions become more pronounced.

The spokesmen and politicians of the bourgeoisie claim that present-day capitalism is moving in the direction of "the affluent society", of the "consumer society". In saying so they "forget" to indicate the kind of man and

Modern Capitalism  
in Conflict with Man

the kind of affluence they have in mind; for when all is said and done there are under capitalism the man who owns the means of production, the capitalist, and also the worker in the factory and the farmer working on his field.

The big property owners, although a very small minority of the population, are the real masters in capitalist society. Presumably it is these the bourgeois spokesmen have in mind when they talk about "affluence" and the "consumer society". To the big capitalists belong the commanding heights in the economy, in political and intellectual life; they are the owners of immense wealth. The American sociologist C. Wright Mills in his *The Power Elite* (1959) showed that at the top of American society were 120 families with annual incomes in excess of one million dollars, 379 in excess of half a million dollars, while some 47 per cent of American families had annual incomes ranging from 3,000 to 7,500 dollars, and about 46 per cent with incomes less than 3,000 dollars. At the beginning of the sixties there were at least 85 families whose personal capital exceeded 75 million dollars each. Clearly the owners of capital have unlimited opportunities to satisfy their consumer needs and their every whim and caprice. In their extravagance the millionaires of modern America have surpassed even the monarchs and the princes of the past. They squander enormous sums on building and maintaining mansions, on luxury yachts, private railway lines, trains and airplanes. And the source of this enormous wealth? Most assuredly it is not in honest labour. It has been calculated, for example that to reach the level of a Rockefeller, a Mellon or a Dupont, the highly paid American worker would have to save his wages for something like a million years. The source of this wealth is the exploitation of the working people, exploitation which is essentially inhuman and contrary to man's nature, to his lofty mission and his place in life.

And while monopoly profits are rising, the share of the working class in the national income falls. This is exemplified by the situation in the US manufacturing industry. Between 1959 and 1969, the hourly output per worker rose 45.5 per cent, while real wages increased a mere 12.8 per cent. As a result the rate of exploitation went up 29 per cent and real wages per unit of production were reduced 22.5 per cent.

It can be affirmed that in some of the highly developed capitalist countries (United States, Federal Germany, Britain, France, Italy and others) the wages of the working class provide a fairly high standard of living for quite a considerable part of the workers. But it should not be forgotten that this relatively high level of consumption has its counterpart in the poverty of large numbers of the working population in these countries and also in the abysmal poverty and illiteracy of the overwhelming majority of the population in other countries which, for one or another reason, are backward in their development. Even in the rich United States over 27 million citizens live in poverty, and in some parts of the country people often go hungry. And what is one to say about the low level of consumption in the less developed countries where per capita national income is many, many times lower than in the United States?

Thus, for example, if per capita national income in the US in 1969 was 3,796 dollars, the figure for Pakistan was 121, for Nigeria 80, India 73 and for Malawi 58 dollars.

In the United States millions of black citizens are subjected to the most brutal exploitation, to political and intellectual enslavement. According to approximate data, the monopolies during the 1940s derived an annual 4,000 million dollars from the super-exploitation of the black people.

In some highly developed countries of Western Europe the plight of the blacks in the United States is repeated in the miserable existence of the millions of immigrant workers forced to leave their countries in order to obtain a livelihood. In the countries of their adoption they are subjected to the same ruthless exploitation and discrimination, and they are deprived of all political rights. Obligated to perform the most laborious and dangerous work, they receive less pay than the local workers.

The millions of unemployed, ousted by imperialism from the sphere of production, deprived thereby of the opportunity to work—perhaps the most important and profound manifestation of man's essence—cannot even dream of living a real human life. In the imperialist countries the wholly unemployed number from 6 to 8 million, with tens of millions more working part time. In the United States, according to official and obviously understated data,

3,406,000 workers were unemployed in January 1970, with the share for "non-whites" more than double the corresponding figure for whites. And worst hit are the blacks. Endless misery, physical deterioration and cultural impoverishment—such is the fate of the unwanted in the "affluent society". Inflation sends the cost of living soaring and real incomes of the working people tumbling down. During the period of 1957-67 the cost of living in the United States and in eleven countries of Western Europe rose in scales ranging from 18.7 to 100 per cent. Between February 1969 and February 1970 the cost of living in the USA rose 6.3 per cent.

There seems to be no end to the rising taxation. In the United States, Britain, Federal Germany, France and Italy the state, through its tax policy, absorbs some 30 to 35 per cent of the national income, with the main burden of the taxation borne by the working people. In Britain, for example, the working people pay in taxes from 25.1 to 36.1 per cent of their incomes, for Federal Germany the figure is in the region of 36 per cent.

In their pursuit of maximum profits the monopolies intensify labour and accelerate speed-up, and mostly to the detriment of the working man. Premature exhaustion, growth of industrial accidents and of occupational diseases and mental disorders—all add up to a genuine social tragedy. In the United States, for example, 55 industrial workers lose their lives every day, 8,500 lose the ability to work, while 27,500 suffer from various injuries; about half of all the hospital beds in the country are taken by psychiatric patients, and even so only about half of those needing it are able to get treatment.

Capitalism has always grudging expenditure on public health. As a rule, medical care in most capitalist countries is a costly matter for the worker and his family. For the American family, for example, it costs on the average each year practically one month's earnings. The working people in the capitalist countries experience grave difficulties with housing, but worst of all, perhaps, is the plight of the old-age pensioners.

Having monopolised the right to intellectual labour, the ruling class is able to keep the mind of the working man captive, to restrict his opportunities for education, science

and culture. The education provided for the working people is maintained at a level that suits the ruling class; schooling for the children of workers is restricted largely to levels that determine their fate as labourers for the factory owners.

Imperialism's inhumanity to man can be seen plainly in the monstrous militarisation of the economy. Enormous wealth created by the hands and the brains of working people instead of being used for betterment of their lives and their surroundings is diverted to the manufacture of means of mass destruction. In the United States, for example, military expenditure over the past twenty postwar years has been running at 48 times the expenditure for this purpose in the two decades that preceded the Second World War. In the ten years 1959-68, US military expenditure reached the astronomical figure of 551,000 million dollars, a sum 15 times greater than the 1967 national income of a country the size of India.

If we turn to the NATO military political bloc, the expenditure during the twenty years of its existence has swallowed the enormous sum of 1,300,000 million dollars. At the moment NATO's annual military expenditure is in excess of 100,000 million dollars. This adds up to a fearful waste of energy and labour, of vast resources and values which could well be used for constructive purposes. And the bill for this insane squandermania is footed by the taxpayer, that is, the billions of dollars are extracted from the working people in the NATO countries. These sums would be adequate to satisfy the multifarious economic and social needs of the peoples, such as providing adequate housing and getting rid at long last of the slums, ensuring free medical care, free education at all levels, large-scale building of schools, hospitals and other amenities and services, humane conditions for the aged, a more rapid advance in science and technology, including the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, space research, regulating the climate and exploring and using the wealth of the ocean floor.

But in the conditions of imperialism this is impossible. After all, is not the war business the largest and the most profitable enterprise of the monopolies?

Science and technology open up the prospect of raising the material well-being and cultural level of the working

man to heights never previously attained. Yet the monopolies not only retard utilisation of the modern achievements for the benefit of man, they frequently turn them against him as a monstrous means of annihilation.

Concentrated in the hands of the monopolies is the bulk of the complex and costly results of research and development. The results of this work are used by them for purposes of monopoly profits and the conquest of markets. The rigid secrecy of research and development, caused by the competitive struggle, makes for difficulties in exchanging scientific information, which often results in parallel working, in squandering money and in wasting the time of researchers. Thousands of valuable inventions and discoveries are locked away in the safes of the monopolies in anticipation of a possible increase in their "commercial" value. Industrial production of nylon, for example, began only in 1946-47, that is fourteen years after its invention in 1932.

Diverting science and technology to war aims poses a really grave danger to man. Something like two-thirds of all American and about three-fifths of British researchers and engineers are working on projects associated with military purposes. More than two-thirds of all the allocations for science in the United States are spent on research of a military nature.

As noted in the Main Document of the International Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969, capitalism uses the scientific and technological revolution for the purpose of swelling its profits and intensifying the exploitation of the working people.

The revolution in science and technology has accelerated the process of socialisation in the economy which, in the conditions of monopoly domination, leads to a growth of social antagonisms, rendering them more acute. The existing antagonisms become sharper, gain in intensity and new ones appear. And right in the foreground is the antagonism between the unprecedented opportunities opened up and the road blocks erected by capitalism to prevent their utilisation on behalf of society as a whole, to channel a large part of the new discoveries and immense material resources to military ends, all of which add up to a squandering of the national wealth. Then we have the contradiction between

the social character of modern production and the state-monopoly mode of its regulation. This is something more than a sharpening of the antagonism between labour and capital, it is a deepening also of the antagonism between the overwhelming majority of the nation and the financial oligarchy.

It follows, then, that inhumanity is the essence of present-day capitalism—it is anti-mankind generally, but especially it is against the working man.

What is the way out? In our view, there is but one answer—the *revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and its replacement by socialism*. And today, more so than ever before, the words of Lenin take on a topical meaning: "Socialism is now gazing at us from all the windows of modern capitalism; socialism is outlined directly, practically, by every important measure that constitutes a forward step on the basis of this modern capitalism."<sup>1</sup> The necessity of socialism is dictated by the entire march of the modern historical process, by the needs of the social and scientific and technological progress.

Man's path to the socialist morrow was charted by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. This revolution ushered in the new era, the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism. And now we will take a closer look at this new era.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 359.

## CHAPTER TWO

### OUR ERA—THE ERA OF THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM

#### 1. The Basic Content of the Present Epoch

The overall picture of contemporary society is an exceedingly complex scheme in which different socio-economic formations and sectors, different classes and social groups, different nations and states are interweaving, interacting and conflicting. One-third of mankind is building socialism and communism, the other two-thirds live in non-socialist countries. Among the latter there are highly developed capitalist countries, or imperialist countries, as well as countries which to this day are still in the pre-capitalist phase. Several dozens of millions, mostly Africans, remain under the yoke of colonialism.

The ideologues of the bourgeoisie, a class now on the way out, blinded by their class interests and lacking the scientific method of cognition, are not adequately equipped to come to terms with the numerous and complex social events of our day. Some of them say forthrightly that it is impossible to define the epoch and to indicate with any degree of precision whither man, because things taking place in society are indefinite and transient and so much so that any kind of an objective, unprejudiced assessment of them is simply ruled out. Others say that the epoch is defined by the technological developments and chiefly by the harnessing of atomic energy. For these sociologists the thing that stands out in our modern epoch is the Bomb, while the epoch itself is characterised as the century of technology, the atomic century. But it is impossible to reduce social development solely to technology, even when its discoveries do play a very big role in social development. In assessing technology it is essential to bear in mind that it influences the historical process not of its own volition but through

the complex system of social relationships and, above all, through the predominant production relationships in society. And it is these relationships and the classes standing behind them that must be the starting point in any analysis of the modern epoch.

Only Marxism-Leninism is able to undertake this. The content of the new epoch in history, Lenin used to say, is the abolition of capitalism and its consequences and the introduction of the principles of the communist order.

Lenin regarded the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism not as a single act but as an entire historical epoch of conflict between the two diametrically opposed social systems. Lenin saw in the *international working class* the standard bearer of the new epoch, and he dated the onset of the epoch from the Great October Socialist Revolution—the first to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin firmly believed that the dictatorship of the proletariat, victorious at first in one country, would grow from a national into an international, worldwide dictatorship of the proletariat, that the socialist way would be taken by more and more nations and states.

Lenin's definition of the modern epoch is substantiated by the entire development of modern man, by the revolutionary liberation struggle of the peoples. The point about this definition is that it reflects the decisive events of our time—the triumph of the socialist revolution in a whole number of countries and the growth of socialism into a powerful world system, the decline of imperialism, its crisis, and the disintegration of the colonial system.

**The October Revolution Begins the Modern Era** The 25th of October (7th of November, new style) 1917, the day when the workers in alliance with the working peasantry overthrew the rule of the bourgeoisie and landowners in Russia and established their own power—the dictatorship of the proletariat—has gone down in history as the beginning of the modern epoch, the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism. "...We have a right to be and are proud," Lenin wrote apropos of this, "that to us has fallen the good fortune to *begin* the building of a Soviet state, and thereby to *usher in* a new era in world history, the era of the rule of a *new* class, a class which is oppressed in every capitalist country, but which everywhere is marching forward

towards a new life, towards victory over the bourgeoisie, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, towards the emancipation of mankind from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars."<sup>1</sup>

The good fortune to be the pioneer in building the new society was a hard-won gain. Many of the best sons of the working people and of the Party gave their lives in the grim struggle against the autocracy, the landowners and the capitalists. Much time and effort were expended by the Party of Communists in rallying the working class and all the revolutionary forces, in organising, tempering and in bringing them into the fight against the system of exploitation. The Russian workers and peasants had to go through the grim school of struggle before they, under the leadership of the Party, could carry out the revolution. Still greater effort and greater sacrifice had to be made in defending the revolution, in defending the first country of the working people. The valiant efforts of the Communist Party, of the industrial working class and all working people in the Soviet country in the fight against the old system were, and remain, an inspiring example to all fighters for the new socialist future.

In addition to putting an end to the system of exploitation and oppression the October Revolution cleared the way for the economic, social and political regeneration of the masses, wrested the country from the slaughter of the 1914-18 imperialist war and shook the capitalist world to its foundations.

In itself the October Revolution was a Russian revolution, a revolution which had triumphed in one country, and in this sense it was an internal matter of the peoples of Russia. But its reverberations were felt far beyond the boundaries of the country, and it exerted a powerful influence on the subsequent march of world history. It posed and solved a whole number of social problems, problems which nowadays are being solved by the working class and the masses in the non-socialist countries; it confirmed the truth of Marxism-Leninism, enriched the working people of all countries with the valuable experience of struggle against capitalism, for socialism, and *blazed man's way to the new*

*socialist society*. It put an end to the omnipotence of capitalism and it divided the world into two diametrically opposed systems—capitalism and socialism—with the result that it changed the entire course of history.

For the purpose of highlighting the changes that have taken place since the October Revolution let us compare data for 1919 and 1970.

With the triumph of the October Revolution capitalism entered upon the period of its general crisis, the period of

Table

	1919				1970			
	Territory		Population (estimated)		Territory		Population (estimated)	
	Mln. sq. km.	% of total	Mln. sq. km.	% of total	Mln. sq. km.	% of total	Mln. sq. km.	% of total
World as a whole	135.8	100	1,777	100	135.8	100	3,620	100
of which:								
socialist countries	21.7	16	138	7.8	35.2	25.9	1,200	33.1
other countries	114.1	84	1,639	92.2	100.6	74.1	2,420	66.9
Major imperialist countries — USA, Britain, France, West Germany (in 1919 Germany), Japan, Italy — and their colonies	60.3	44.4	855	48.1	12.1	8.9	545.8	15.1
All colonies and semi-colonies	97.8	72	1,235	69.4	4.8	3.6	35.8	1
Ex-colonies and semi-colonies which became sovereign states after 1919—excluding socialist countries					79.2	58.4	1,704	47.1

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 55.

the sharpening of all its contradictions and of the narrowing of the sphere of capitalist exploitation. Conditions for the revolutionary struggle of the working people throughout the world became more favourable, since they now had in the first working-class state a powerful ally and friend on whom they could rely.

The October Revolution acted as a powerful stimulus to the international working-class movement. Under its direct influence the workers in many countries and in different parts of the world rose in struggle against the exploiters. Revolutionary outbreaks took place in Germany, in Austro-Hungary and in other European countries and mass revolutionary actions were fought also on the American continent.

On the example of the Party founded by Lenin and under the influence of its victory, dozens of Marxist parties came into existence in Europe and Asia, in Africa and America, parties which united organisationally and ideologically in the Third, Communist International. The founding of the new International inaugurated the modern communist movement, and for Communists all over the world the International became an excellent proving ground for revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The October Revolution awakened the peoples of the colonial and the dependent countries where a powerful wave of national liberation struggles was set in motion. This marked the beginning of the disintegration of imperialism's colonial system and the precondition for the complete emancipation of the oppressed nations.

Thus, as a result of the October Revolution or directly influenced by it the *basic revolutionary forces of the modern epoch* took shape and, what is more, the beginnings were made for their fusing in the single world-wide revolutionary process presently undermining and destroying imperialism. Let us dwell for a moment on this world-wide revolutionary process and on its main motive forces.

**The World  
Revolutionary  
Process and Its Main  
Motive Forces**

The contemporary world revolutionary process—the process of man's advance from capitalism to socialism—is embodied in the single stream of struggle against imperialism in which are fused: the efforts of the peoples of the socialist system currently building

socialism and communism; the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries; the national liberation struggle, the struggle of the oppressed nations against colonialism, for national sovereignty, economic independence and social progress.

Taking part in each of these movements are particular classes and social forces, each having its own concrete tasks and employing for their solution specific methods and means, while all of them in their totality are sapping the pillars of imperialism and, in one way or another, are indicative of man's advance towards a happy communist future. *This unity of the revolutionary forces is the guarantee of success in the great cause of peace, progress and socialism.*

*In the countries comprising the socialist system* the people are building socialism and communism, paving man's way to the new society; they are engaged in economic competition with the capitalist world system, demonstrating in practice the advantages of the new system, striving for world records of labour productivity and advancing towards the highest standard of living for the working people; these powerful material and intellectual forces counterpose to imperialism and reaction by standing guard over peace and socialism.

*The working class in the capitalist countries*, taking advantage of the favourable international and internal conditions (the changed balance of world forces in favour of socialism, the popular discontent with the reactionary policies of imperialism, etc.), is fighting back against the economic and political domination of the monopolies, for socialism, for peace and security of the nations, for wide-reaching democratic transformations. Sapping the pillars of capitalism from inside, they are preparing and precipitating the end of world capitalism.

*In the developing countries and also in those still in colonial dependence* the peoples are battling resolutely for political statehood and economic independence, for well-being and social progress; they are shattering the colonial system of imperialism, undermining its immediate hinterland, depriving it of sources of raw materials, labour power and markets, of military footholds and sources of cannon fodder; and they are accelerating the process of the de-

struction of capitalism, the process of man's advance towards socialism.

"Imperialism," we read in the Main Document of the 1969 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, *"can neither regain its lost historical initiative nor reverse world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces."*<sup>1</sup> At the centre of the revolutionary forces are the working class and its offspring—product of its long years of struggle—the world socialist system which, in ever-growing measure, is becoming the decisive factor of world history.

## 2. The Socialist System Is Becoming the Decisive Factor in World Development

In today's world socialism is no longer just a teaching, a theory. It is the reality of our times, a real society extending over a vast part of the world. Socialism has been established in the USSR and in a number of other countries in Europe, Asia and South America. The world socialist system, still quite young, is growing rapidly, gaining strength and becoming consolidated. Whereas at the outbreak of the Second World War it covered 17 per cent of the area of the world, by 1970 the figure had risen to 25.9 per cent; and whereas in 1939 it accounted for some 9 per cent of the world population, the figure at this writing is in excess of 34 per cent. The world socialist system is a community of fourteen large and small countries spread over Europe, Asia and Latin America. In a brief space of time most of these states—in the past at low levels of economic development—have become highly developed countries with modern industry and a much higher standard of living; remarkable strides have been made in the spheres of education and culture.

Now, with the steady growth of the socialist forces, the way to socialism is open to any country irrespective of its

<sup>1</sup> *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, p. 13.*

level of development, geographical location, size and population.

### Inter-state Relations of a New Type

The world socialist system, an economic and political community of free and sovereign nations advancing to socialism and communism, is united by identity of interests and aims and by bonds of international socialist solidarity. *Qualitatively speaking, these are new economic and political inter-state relationships* based on common economic, political and ideological interests. The economic base of the community is public ownership of the means of production. Its political base is rule by the people headed by the working class and its Marxist parties. The Marxist world outlook provides its ideological base.

These inter-state relations can be described as relations of steadily growing economic, political and cultural co-operation and mutual aid, relations which bring the nations into closer kinship by virtue of their common aim. Full equality of the countries, big and small, non-intervention in internal affairs, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, fraternal economic mutual aid, close collaboration in all spheres of public life—such are the fundamental principles of the inter-state relationships of the socialist countries. The growing rapprochement of their peoples, deriving from these principles, is a cardinal feature of the world socialist system.

The forms of this rapprochement and the inter-state co-operation and mutual aid are varied.

In the *economic* sphere one helps another in establishing a modern industry, in achieving rapid growth rates, in raising labour productivity and, on this foundation, the material well-being and cultural level of the working people, in training specialists and researchers.

In recent times direct production co-operation is expressed in co-ordination of the national plans, in specialisation and co-operation based on complete equality and voluntary participation. Co-operation is effected by way of bilateral and also multilateral agreements through the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), established in 1949 as an international economic organisation of socialist countries. This economic co-operation facilitates rational utilisation of raw material and fuel and power resources.

Today the socialist countries, which are members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, have embarked on the path of *socialist economic integration*. Its essence is to pool the labour, material and financial resources of a number of countries for the purpose of securing the further advance of production both in each individual country and the socialist community as a whole. Of especially great importance is the unification of the scientific and technical potentials of CMEA countries, their joint development and use of the latest technology with a view to securing the fast rate of scientific and technological progress and intensive production on this basis.

Integration is a conscious and systematic process of drawing together the economies of socialist countries by streamlining the mechanism of all-round and stable production and technical ties, the expansion of the common market of socialist countries, the extension of currency and credit operations. Integration implies the internationalisation of the entire economic, political and spiritual life of mankind, the feasibility and necessity of which was foreseen by Lenin.<sup>1</sup>

Socialist economic integration was prepared by the economic achievements scored by CMEA countries. On the other hand, these achievements—the fruit of the socialist peoples' labour and struggle—are largely conditioned by the relations of co-operation and mutual aid.

The 24th CPSU Congress resolution indicates: "The line of the states of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance towards inter-state specialisation and co-operation of production, close co-ordination of national economic plans, and economic integration is an expression of the objective requirements of the development of world socialism."

The *scientific and technological co-operation* is steadily acquiring greater dimensions. There is co-operation in training specialists and researchers for some countries in others where the facilities favour this. The co-operation in this sphere accelerates the research, avoids duplication and ensures a more rational utilisation of personnel and equipment.

<sup>1</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 246.

The growing *political co-operation* of socialist countries makes possible their joint line of action in tackling the social problems of international and internal life, their common struggle against imperialist reaction, for peace, socialism and social progress. This takes place by way of exchanges of government and Party delegations, friendly talks, exchanges of information and meetings to discuss various subjects.

In view of the intensified aggressive actions by the imperialists great significance attaches to the *military co-operation* of the socialist countries, expressed in strengthening and improving the Warsaw Pact organisation—the reliable shield of these countries. On land, on the high seas and in the air mutually agreed plans are worked out by the staffs of the allied armies and the fraternity of their armed forces becomes stronger.

*Cultural co-operation*, designed to facilitate the growth of the national cultures and their mutual enrichment, is widely practised too.

**Consolidating Unity** *Consolidating the unity of the world socialist system on the basis of proletarian internationalism* is essential to the progress of the individual countries. This unity is incompatible with nationalism and Great-Power chauvinism which are injurious to the common interests of the socialist community and the world communist movement.

There is nothing fortuitous about the need for this unity, for the growing rapprochement of the socialist nations is not always effected painlessly and smoothly. At times contradictions make their appearance in interstate relations, new and difficult problems crop up, problems engendered by all the complexities and nuances of everyday life.

The formation of the socialist community and its development, a long-term and complicated process, can hardly be a smooth and simple matter seeing that it embraces countries at varying levels of economic, social and cultural life, countries with different histories, traditions and customs. Moreover, it is complicated because we encounter here the shaping of interstate relations of an entirely new kind and, as we know, the new is always accompanied by difficulties and complexities. The process of the coming together of nations presupposes, for instance, getting rid

of the ballast of the past, especially the hangovers of bourgeois nationalism the roots of which are deep and tenacious. Hence the need to educate the working people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and solidarity of the socialist countries.

Any departure from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism is likely to have grave consequences both for socialism and for the genuine national interests of the peoples. Proof of this is the situation presently taking shape in China. The reckless course pursued by the Chinese leadership, in which we see a fusion of petty-bourgeois adventurism and Great-Power chauvinism wrapped up in "Left" phraseology, the line of undermining the unity of the socialist community, of splitting the world communist movement, have gravely weakened the position of the Chinese working class and of its Communist Party. The country in the grip of petty-bourgeois, anarchistic elements is ruled by a military-bureaucratic dictatorship. Key positions in policy-making, in the economy and in ideological matters have been seized by the military. The socialist gains of the people of China are seriously threatened.

The unity of the world socialist system is all the more necessary because the imperialists are doing everything in their power to destroy it, to detach one or another country from the socialist community. This was seen in Hungary in 1956 and also in the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 where, encouraged by imperialist circles in the West, counter-revolutionary and revisionist forces sought to take the country out of the socialist system and, ultimately, to restore capitalism.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries extended immediate aid to the Czechoslovak people in defending the gains of socialism, including military aid.

*Unity and solidarity multiply the forces of socialism.* The more solid the unity of the socialist countries, the more closely they combine their efforts in developing the economy and culture and in improving the well-being of the people, the firmer their political co-operation, the more convincingly will socialism demonstrate its superiority over capitalism and the more effective the influence exerted by the socialist system on the entire march of history.

#### A Mighty Force of World Development

Gone for ever are the days when imperialism was the sole master on our planet. At the present time it is not imperialism but those forces aligned against it, the forces standing for peace, socialism and social progress and, above all, *the world socialist system that determine the main trend, the main content and the main features of the world process.* Under the steady pressure of world socialism the one-time omnipotent capitalist system is gradually—though possibly not as swiftly as one would like—and irrevocably crumbling and disintegrating; it is being replaced by the new formation which has inscribed on its banners the words Peace and Work, Freedom and Equality, Fraternity and Happiness.

Nowadays not a single important problem of social development can be solved without the active participation of the socialist world. *This growth of the world socialist system into the decisive factor of man's development is the main distinguishing feature of our epoch.* What is more, the greater the success of the socialist system, the more its role will grow in the economic, political and ideological life of mankind.

This, however, is not to say that the capitalist world can be written off. Imperialism still disposes of very great economic, political and military strength which enables it to meddle in the affairs of different countries, impose on them reactionary regimes and crush the forces of revolution. Imperialism, especially North American imperialism, has become more aggressive; however, this does not mean that the balance of forces in the world is tilted in its favour. On the contrary, this aggressiveness is a sign of the growing difficulties and contradictions with which present-day capitalism is beset. The march of time is the proof that no matter the methods and means to which it resorts, imperialism is unable to apply the brakes to progress, to arrest the ever-growing influence exerted by the world socialist system.

This influence is exerted through successes in economic construction and in the economic competition with capitalism. "...We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution," Lenin wrote, "through our economic policy.... The struggle in this field has now

become global. Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale."<sup>1</sup>

Notwithstanding the exceedingly unfavourable conditions in which the Soviet Union began its economic competition against capitalism (economic backwardness, the devastation caused by the world war and the civil war, and economic blockade), thanks to the valiant efforts of the people the economic lag of the USSR behind the highly developed countries of capitalism was overcome. Whereas in 1917 Russia's share in world industrial output was less than 3 per cent, by 1937, it was in the vicinity of 10 per cent. So that in something like twenty years the Soviet Union in its economic development traversed a path which had taken capitalist countries scores of years. It became a highly developed industrial country and achieved complete economic independence.

After the Second World War, having made good the fearful devastation, the Soviet Union in 1968 accounted for almost 20 per cent of world industrial output. And this progress, it should be said, was achieved not by exploiting and plundering its own people and other peoples as was the case with a number of capitalist countries, it was the result of the advantages deriving from socialism. What better proof could one have of the resilience of socialism, of its superiority over capitalism!

Considerable headway in economic upbuilding has been made also in the other socialist countries whose share in world output is rising steadily. Whereas in 1950 it amounted approximately to 20 per cent and nearly 27 per cent in 1955, by 1969 it had reached 39 per cent of world industrial output. What is more, economic growth in the socialist countries is accompanied by a steady rise in the well-being of the people, whereas under capitalism increased production benefits chiefly the handful of big capitalists.

*Socialism is a splendid example to the peoples of the world in solving socio-political problems.* For where is there another social system in which all members of society achieve political equality, in which each, being co-owner of the means of production, enjoys the right to take part in managing the affairs of society, to elect and be elected to the

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

organs of power? In no other social system has it been possible to solve the age-old peasant question, to ensure that the tiller of the soil works for himself and for his community? And in what other social system has it been possible to solve one of the most complex and difficult questions of human development—the national issue, and achieve equality for the different nations, big and small, of all races and colour.

Socialism is a wonderful example to the entire world in the spheres of education and culture. The Soviet Union, in the past a backward country with something like 80 per cent of the population illiterate, has become a country with a truly high level of culture. Socialism places in the service of man the cultural heritage of the ages.

True, the Soviet Union still lags behind the more developed countries in the matter of output per capita. However, the time is approaching when this lag, too, will be made good, and with this accomplished socialism will have triumphed over capitalism in the decisive sphere of human activity—the sphere of material production. The certainty of this is based on the fact that socialism is catching up with capitalism in rate of growth. For example, in 1970 industrial output in the socialist countries compared with 1937 amounted to 1,200 per cent, whereas the figure for the capitalist countries was 350. At the moment the Soviet Union leads the world in space exploration, in nuclear physics, mathematics, electronics, radio-technology, metallurgy, missile technology and aircraft construction.

It would be wrong, of course, to say that economic and cultural development in the socialist countries is all plain sailing. Building a new society, especially a socialist economy and especially in countries which in their majority were backward in the past, is not an easy undertaking. It goes without saying that in this new and complex undertaking, difficulties and shortcomings and even mistakes were inevitable. But these were chiefly mistakes of a subjective nature. However, headed by the Communist Parties the people in the socialist countries correct their mistakes, overcome the shortcomings and difficulties and guide the economy and all public life in conformity with the objective laws. Moreover, the people know that the strength of socialism and its impact on the world depend both on the unity of

the socialist countries and on how successfully the plans are fulfilled.

Defining the features of the socialist world at the present stage, the 1969 International Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow drew the conclusion that the member-countries had reached the phase in which it was now possible to make fuller use of the reserves latent in the new system. This will be promoted by adopting more improved economic and political forms corresponding to the needs of a mature socialist society and to the tasks confronting it.

Developing socialist democracy, expanding the productive forces, advances in the political and cultural spheres, the attraction of human and moral values—all have added to the influence exerted by socialism on the working people of the world, have reinforced its positions in the world-wide historic fight against imperialism.

The world socialist system extends all-round support to *the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries*. It is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle, as is stressed in the Main Document of the International Meeting in Moscow. Every liberation struggle benefits from this support, especially given by the Soviet Union.

This is at once moral support, wholehearted solidarity and approval, admiration for and sympathy with the valiant struggle of the working class. It is also direct material support—finance, food, and other aid to the working people suffering from arbitrary action by the imperialists, to victims of mining and natural disasters. This support imparts strength to the working class and its allies in their exceedingly difficult struggle, imparts confidence in their coming victory and enables them all the time to be conscious of the friendly hand of their class comrades.

The peoples of the socialist countries raise their voices in protest against the reactionary policy of the ruling imperialist circles, against the persecution of the Communist Parties and of other progressive organisations and personalities, against anti-labour and anti-democratic laws and against the atrocities perpetrated by the imperialists. The socialist countries condemned Franco's regime in Spain, the regime of the "black" colonels in Greece, the racist regime

in South Africa and the racial policy of the rulers of the southern states in the USA.

In their struggle the working people in the capitalist countries are conscious of the support of the socialist world in combating export of counter-revolution by the reactionaries.

The socialist countries are the irreconcilable opponents of colonialism, the most consistent supporters of the *national liberation* movement of the oppressed peoples, supporters of their national equality and political independence. Acting against the colonial domination of imperialism and in every way helping the fight of the peoples for independence, *the world socialist system has been and is a powerful factor in the rise of the national liberation movement and in the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism.*

From their own experience the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America know that in the Soviet Union and in the world socialist system they have good friends and dependable allies. Whereas previously the imperialists were able unhindered to suppress the liberation movements of the peoples, today they are compelled to take into account the growing strength of world socialism which, in word and deed and not excluding armed aid, helps the peoples not only to gain independence but also to uphold it and to step out along the highway of peace and progress. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries helped the United Arab Republic to repel the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression in 1956 and helped Cuba in 1961, at the time of the attack by US imperialism and its hirelings. They were a powerful barrier in the way of the Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples in 1967.

The socialist world helps the liberated countries in training and building up their national defence forces, enabling them successfully to counter the imperialist aggression. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries help the young sovereign states in building the national economy, in developing education, science and technology, thus helping them to overcome the backwardness inherited from colonialism, to rid them for ever of the oppression by foreign monopolies. The CMEA countries are presently providing economic and technical aid to 53 developing countries. By 1967 these countries had completed, with CMEA aid, the

building of 1,981 undertakings and had begun work on another 1,115.

With Soviet aid alone the developing countries in the postwar years (up to January 1, 1970) were either building or planning to build a total of 714 enterprises of which 289 had been completed. Invaluable aid has been extended to the developing countries in training personnel for the economy, education, science and technology. The economic development of the young sovereign states is facilitated also by their mutually advantageous trade with the socialist world.

This aid, it should be said, is not accompanied by political strings or concessions of any kind; nor does it signify interference in the internal affairs of the receiving countries. In this we see the fundamental difference between socialist aid and the aid of the imperialists, and especially of the USA, which is used as a means of economic and political enslavement of the young national states.

#### The World Socialism and the Struggle for Peace

The world socialist system exerts a powerful influence on the solution of one of the vital problems of our times, *the issue of war and peace*. This dedication to peace derives from the very nature of socialist society. For under socialism the economic basis for wars—private ownership—has been abolished; absent, too, are social forces likely to have a stake in war, nor is there any such thing as the plunder and enslavement of other nations and states. Socialism is both constructive and creative, and the pursuit of these lofty purposes is impossible without action for peace and against the forces of destruction. These, then, are the underlying motives of the steadfast struggle for peace and for peaceful co-existence waged by the socialist countries.

Although the echoes of the cannonades of the Second World War have long since died away, here and there as a result of sallies by the imperialists we see outbreaks of so-called local wars each of which is fraught with a world conflict. For this reason the socialist countries strive to extinguish these dangerous outbreaks at the very outset and do everything to ensure that the controversial issues which arise between the states are solved by way of negotiation. They do all in their power to help the peoples repel aggres-

sive onslaughts by the imperialists. Proof of this is the all-out support to the valiant people of Vietnam struggling against US aggression.

Thanks to Soviet initiative, agreement has been reached on banning nuclear explosions on land, in the air and under water, and on keeping outer space free from weapons of wholesale annihilation, on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons—an initiative warmly applauded and supported by the peace-loving nations. In the spring of 1968 a number of socialist countries addressed the countries of Europe with a proposal for an all-European meeting to discuss European security and peaceful co-operation. This proposal has been received with considerable interest and hope by the peoples of the continent.

Action for peace and for peaceful co-existence by no means signifies weakness on the part of the socialist world nor its capitulation to the capitalist world. The socialist countries possess powerful armed forces which are capable of countering any imperialist aggression. Their armaments include missiles and nuclear weapons of the most varied kinds. Their modern air fleets have enormous speeds and fire-power, and their naval forces include atomic submarines equipped with missiles and with a navigation radius of thousands of miles. Their armed forces are equipped with the most modern automatic devices and telecommunications enabling them to operate on land and in the air, on the surface and under water. And this powerful technique is in the hands of men commanding a profound knowledge of military matters, highly educated and cultured and who at any moment are ready to uphold the gains of socialism.

The Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU delivered by Leonid Brezhnev to the 24th Party Congress (March-April, 1971) outlined a broad programme of the struggle for peace and international security. It provides for the elimination of the hotbeds of war in South-East Asia and the Middle East; the repudiation of the threat or use of force in settling outstanding issues; the convocation and success of an all-European conference to bring about a radical turn towards a détente and peace on this continent; the conclusion of treaties banning nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons; the invigoration of the struggle to halt the race in all types of weapons; the dismantling

of foreign military bases and the abolition of the remaining colonial regimes; the deepening of relations of mutually advantageous co-operation in every sphere with states which for their part seek to do so. This programme has been approved and supported by all peace-loving forces of the world.

In order to combat the imperialist aggression, and especially the aggression of the NATO military bloc, the armies of a number of European socialist countries are joined in the Warsaw Pact. These combined armies stand guard over peace and socialism.

And so while wholeheartedly for peace and peaceful co-existence, the socialist world is a formidable obstacle in the way of the aggressive strivings of imperialism. With the rise of socialism, man for the first time in his history possesses the material forces capable of resolving major international issues in a peaceful way. *The socialist world is, then, a mighty bastion of peace and security of the nations.*

### 3. The Revolutionary Working-Class Movement in the Capitalist Countries

**Main Features of the Working-Class Struggle** Despite claims by the spokesmen of capitalism about the "disappearance of classes" and about "social harmony", we observe in the capitalist world a *titanic battle between labour and capital, a powerful revolutionary movement of the working class.*

The conditions in which this struggle is waged are now more favourable for the working class. The decline of capitalism as a result of its general crisis, the growth of the socialist forces throughout the world and especially the revolutionary influence exerted by the socialist world, the broadening of the social base of the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries—all, in the aggregate, provide better opportunities for the working-class movement. What is more, the labour movement has accumulated considerable experience in the fight against capitalism and its auxiliaries in the ranks of the working class. It has matured ideologically, is well organised and is fired with the spirit of the

offensive. The prestige of the Communist Parties and the role of the trade unions have increased. The organised workers are resolutely repelling the violence of the bourgeoisie, displaying courage and firmness and acting with greater discipline and unity.

In their struggle they resort to the most varied means—strikes and demonstrations, meetings and conferences, and make good use of parliament, press and radio.

Strike action, the traditional and tried weapon of the workers, having acquired massive dimensions, is conducted in a much more organised way. During the past decade, for example, the numbers of strikers more than doubled and in 1970 amounted to 63 million.

Another feature of the struggle is the combining of economic and political forms, an interweaving of the political and economic demands.

In earlier times the workers fought for and won the eight-hour day, for the right to belong to trade unions and for social insurance. Now, however, they are advancing demands of even greater significance such as political rights for all the people, for greater democracy, for disarmament, for peace and social progress. In some countries an important place is taken by the fight for nationalisation and for democratic management of the nationalised industries. The main blows of the working class and its revolutionary vanguard—the Marxist Parties—are aimed against the *big monopolies*, the bulwarks of reaction and aggression and who bear the chief responsibility for the armaments build-up and the plight of the working people.

Another feature of the struggle of the working-class movement is the *extension of its social base*, the trend towards a united front of the progressive forces against the monopolies who mercilessly exploit not only the industrial workers but also the main mass of the peasantry, handicraftsmen, small traders, office employees and professional people.

The monopoly oppression impels the peasants to unite and take action for land and for their rights. Powerful peasant movements have taken place in recent years in France, Italy, Greece, Federal Germany and in other countries. In these actions the peasants make wide use of working-class forms of struggle such as strikes, demonstra-

tions and marches. It frequently happens that industrial workers and peasants act in unity in the fight for agrarian reforms and for the slogan: "Land to the tiller".

Consolidating of this worker-peasant alliance is a basic condition for successful struggle against the power of the monopolies.

Now that science is becoming a direct force of production the ranks of the wage workers are reinforced by growing numbers of professional people most of whom, like the workers in the factories, feel the pinch of the monopoly exploitation. The social interests of the professional people fuse with those of the workers in industry with the result that the alliance of workers by hand and brain becomes a powerful force in the fight for peace, democracy and progress.

In most capitalist countries growing numbers of the young generation—teenagers—are actively participating in public life. Young people in industry and large numbers of students disillusioned by the absence of opportunities under capitalism are, increasingly, joining the struggle against the policy of the ruling class.

The women's participation in the class struggle, in the anti-imperialist movement, and especially in the peace movement is one of the new and heartening features of our time.

Religious people, too, are active in the anti-imperialist actions and in action for social reconstruction, and their participation brings them closer to the working class and to the general aims of the fight against the monopolies.

But while giving all these movements their due, it should be stressed that, as heretofore, the *working class* is the main driving force of the revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries.

#### The Linkage of the Democratic and the Socialist Tasks

Experience affords convincing proof of the limitations of bourgeois democracy which, in reality, is the dictatorship of the ruling capitalist class, a dictatorship of the tiny minority of the rich over the vastly more numerous working people. The working class, however, is not indifferent to this democracy for the reason that, with all its limitations, it affords greater opportunities for prosecuting the revolutionary struggle. And, on the

contrary, in conditions of non-democracy, emergency laws, personal rule and terror it is easier for the monopolies to exploit the working people, to combat their revolutionary actions and to pursue their own reactionary policy. At present it is possible to discern a growth of reactionary trends in capitalism towards rejection of democracy, of parliament and a liking for an overt monopoly dictatorship. In West Germany, for example, we have seen a proliferation of neo-fascist and revanchist organisations, a rebirth of a fascist type of party (NDP) as a force opposed to socialism, for revising the results of the Second World War and for swallowing the German Democratic Republic. Large numbers of nazi war criminals in the FRG go unpunished. In the United States the Communist Party and all progressive organisations suffer from a whole series of anti-labour laws. Yet all kinds of reactionary bodies of the Ku-Klux-Klan type function freely. In 1967, a Washington-inspired reactionary coup was carried out in Greece.

Denial of democracy and political reaction signify more than a brake on the revolutionary movement, they signify trampling on the dignity of the working people, on their elementary rights and freedoms. For this reason the working class, jointly with other sections of the public, engages in resolute action for democracy, rallying the masses against the monopoly attempts to abolish democratic rights and against the rebirth of fascism in any shape or form. *This combining of working-class action for socialism with the general democratic movements for democracy, national independence and peace is yet another feature of the present-day working-class movement.* Hence, the call for democratisation in industry and in public life generally, for nationalisation of the basic industries and their democratic management, better conditions for the working people, defence of peasant and farmer interests, of the lower and middle bourgeoisie against the arbitrary rule of the monopolies, action for national independence, for peace, and utilisation of industry, science and technology for peaceful purposes, in the interests of the working people.

In the course of this combined action for democracy the influence of the reactionary forces, and especially of the monopolies, is weakened and the road to the socialist revolution is widened. In the battle for democracy the working

class becomes better organised, acquires experience and, uniting around itself the majority of the people, creates the political army of the socialist revolution. It follows then that the all-out democratic action against the monopolies far from postponing or averting the socialist revolution precipitates it. *The battle for democracy is, then, a component of the fight for socialism.*

#### Forms of the Socialist Revolution

In our epoch, the epoch of man's advance towards socialism, the question of the particular forms of transition to socialism in the different countries acquires a very great significance. How do we envisage these forms, on what do they depend?

The adversaries of scientific communism, seeking to blacken its noble ideas and to sow doubt about it among the public, declare that socialism always and everywhere is associated with violence and wars. In reality the working class is the most humane class in society. Its purpose is to preserve and multiply the achievements of human culture, to expand the productive forces and safeguard the working people. For these reasons the working class and the working masses generally are vitally interested in establishing their rule without resort to violence, in a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. More than a hundred years ago in reply to the question: "Will it be possible to bring about the abolition of private property by peaceful methods?" Engels replied: "It is to be desired that this could happen, and Communists certainly would be the last to resist it."<sup>1</sup> The peaceful way presupposes saving lives and also vast material values and, for this reason, as Lenin wrote, it is "the least painful", and "the easiest and the most advantageous course for the people".<sup>2</sup>

But the nature of the transition does not depend on the wishes of individuals, it depends chiefly on the *objective relationship of the class forces in the particular country*. In the event of the working class gaining a decisive victory over the bourgeoisie, and should the latter, recognising the hopelessness of their cause, prefer to keep their heads on

their shoulders and yield power to the workers, then the peaceful transition is possible.

Experience teaches, however, that the capitalists, like any other class doomed by history, are incapable of soberly assessing the relationship of forces. With the desperation of the doomed they resort to all means in order to preserve or to regain their lost domination. And of these means the most important is armed force to which the capitalists usually resort whenever their rule is threatened or when the people encroach on their power and privileges. The Paris Commune, as we know, was drowned in blood. And certainly the Russian landowners and capitalists did not become reconciled to the victory of the working people in October 1917. On the contrary, they resorted to civil war and, calling upon foreign capitalist states to come to their aid, they sought with fire and sword to restore capitalism. But under the leadership of the Communist Party the working people defeated this attack and upheld proletarian rule.

The experience of the revolutionary movement provides ample proof that mastery of the methods of armed struggle is obligatory if the capitalist state is to be overthrown. It is another matter whether or not there will be a resort to arms against the bourgeoisie. In the days when the latter had undivided sway throughout the world, when, conscious of its strength, it was able to unite for the fight against the revolutionary people, arms were vital to the conquest of power by the working class. It was not without reason that Lenin, while not ruling out the possibility of a peaceful conquest of power by the proletariat, thought it would be most unlikely and that it would be an extremely rare happening.

But nowadays things are different. The new world balance of forces between socialism and capitalism that set in after the Second World War has greatly enlarged the opportunities for a peaceful transition to socialism. And in point of fact in a number of countries in Europe and Asia the transition from the bourgeois-democratic to the socialist revolution took place without resort to arms. Parliament could be, given the right conditions, a non-violent way to working-class rule. Relying on a popular majority and resolutely combating opportunism, the working class in some of the capitalist countries may be able to use parliament as

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 185.

an instrument serving the people and, overcoming the resistance of the reactionaries, prepare the way for the advance to socialism.

The parliamentary way, being one of the possible avenues leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat, far from being reformist could, by relying on the broad scope of the class struggle, be the stepping stone to a radical revolutionary reconstruction. In the ultimate the successes of this way will be all the more likely the greater the weight of the working class and its allies and the richer the arsenal of means for prosecuting the struggle. It would be naive to imagine that the working class could gain power and consolidate it merely through victory in a general election. For only when the electoral victory has the backing of the full strength of the class ready to defend the victory at the polls with all the means at its disposal, including if necessary the force of arms, only when this is assured, will there be the guarantee that the results of the voting are maintained and consolidated.

The peaceful way should not be seen or regarded as something absolute, nor should its recognition be regarded as a rejection by the working class of armed struggle for the conquest of power. One should not lose sight of the fact that the bourgeoisie still rule in a large part of the world, that it has at its disposal arms which it can use and which it frequently uses against the working people. Hence the workers must be vigilant and ready to use the most varied forms of struggle both peaceful and non-peaceful. The mastery of all forms of struggle, *skilful application of those which correspond most to the actual situation, skill in quickly switching when necessary from one form to the other—these are essentials for the victory of the working class in the socialist revolution.*

#### 4. The Communist Movement Today

**The Communist Movement—the Most Influential Force of the Times**

*The international communist movement, the most numerous and most powerful movement of our time, is the guiding force of the revolutionary*

*struggle of the working class. History does not know of any other political movement experiencing the trials that fell to*

the lot of the Communists. Neither tsarist exile and prisons nor fascist dungeons and death camps, torture and killings could break the will of the Communists, their unshakable belief in the justness of their cause and the resolve to fight for it. Nor does history know of any other political movement with such a record of growth and success.

A little over a century ago the founders of scientific communism formed the first small organisation of communist revolutionaries; today there are 88 Communist Parties with an overall membership of some 50 million. The world-wide communist movement has grown into the most influential force of our time.

The Communist Parties, waging their struggle in greatly varying conditions, are confronted with different tasks.

*In the socialist countries* where they are the ruling parties, the people, having abolished capitalism, are now engaged in building socialism and communism. This presupposes vast constructive work, expanding the economy, shaping the new social relationships, looking after the communist education of the masses, protecting the socialist gains and, in addition, all-round aid to the people of the non-socialist countries in their revolutionary struggle. The significance of the constructive work of the Communist Parties in the socialist countries is that it buttresses the international position of socialism and heightens its power of attraction throughout the world.

*In the capitalist countries* where the Parties are in action against the grim conditions of the undemocratic regime, many of them are forced to work underground. They are still confronted with the task of bringing their peoples to victory over capitalism, to the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the van of the acute fight against the monopolies, the Parties are forming the political forces of the revolution, working to extend their influence on the masses. The most active fighters for the unity of the working class, the Communists are combating the treacherous policy of the Right-wing Social Democrats, aimed at maintaining capitalism and dividing the working-class movement.

*The Communist Parties in Asia, Africa and Latin America*, products of the national liberation revolutions, are growing stronger, exerting an ever-increasing influence on the development of newly-free countries, and actively

participating in the fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism. Here the task is to complete the national liberation revolutions, consolidate the newly-gained national independence and take their people along the highway of peace and progress to socialism.

Despite this variety of aims and tasks all the Communist Parties are engaged in but a single undertaking—that of *heading the advance of mankind from capitalism to socialism*.

Basing themselves on Marxism-Leninism, generalising the experience of more than a century of proletarian class struggle, the Communist Parties at their international gatherings in 1957, 1960 and 1969 jointly worked out the general line of their international movement, a line clearly reflecting its basic aims, the line of *class struggle and socialist revolution*. The Communists hold that the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat are needed for the transition to socialism, a transition which, as we have said, can be effected in diverse ways.

The Communist Parties are and always have been *the avowed opponents of colonialism*. Wholeheartedly supporting the national liberation movement, they are working to bring the democratic, anti-imperialist revolution to a successful conclusion, to gain genuine national independence and to take the way of non-capitalist development.

The Communists have always been active fighters against imperialist reaction, for democratic rights and freedoms for the working people. In anti-imperialist and democratic movements they see their allies in the struggle against capitalism and for socialism. For the communist movement, the most truly humane movement of our time, the fight for peace and for the peaceful co-existence of countries with differing social systems is basic. In pursuing this aim the Communists seek to unite the efforts of all the peace-loving and anti-imperialist forces.

For Unity  
in the World  
Communist Movement

In the ever-sharpening struggle between the socialist and imperialist forces *action for the unity of the international communist and workers' movement* acquires the greatest significance. This task is all the more topical because at present the movement, for a

variety of reasons, is not without difficulties and differences.

We encounter, for example, differing degrees of maturity and theoretical and organisational preparation of the Communist Parties, due chiefly to the rapid growth of the movement.

Then there are the different tasks confronting these Parties and the different approaches to the solution of these tasks, approaches conditioned by the specific features of the particular country, features of a psychological nature, habits, customs and traditions.

Tenacity of prejudice also plays its part, especially nationalist prejudice deriving from the policy of the exploiting classes, from the age-old animosities and mistrust between nations.

And lastly, we encounter the crafty policy of the imperialist forces who are doing their utmost to drive a wedge between the different units of the communist movement, and also the treacherous splitting role of opportunists of all kinds.

The opponents of Marxism-Leninism stake heavily on nationalism and nationalists for divisive purposes in the world communist movement. The capitalists, Lenin wrote, seek to *divide* the workers "by advocating different bourgeois ideas and doctrines designed to weaken the struggle of the working class.

"One such idea is refined nationalism, which advocates the division and splitting up of the proletariat of the most plausible and specious pretexts."<sup>1</sup> In this context special attention should be paid to the *correct combination of the national and international tasks of the different detachments of the great army of Communists*.

Being internationalists, the Marxists-Leninists are at the same time genuine patriots, men and women imbued with a profound sense of national duty. In working for the emancipation of their people from the oppression of capital they do not separate the national from the international. They do, however, subordinate the particular to the general, for they realise that the emancipation of their own working class necessitates combined effort by the national sections of the workers and Communists in all countries.

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 289.

While the differences in the Communist ranks are grave, they can and will be overcome: after all, the unity of the world communist movement is vital to success in the fight against capitalism, for socialism and communism. But the differences in theoretical and political spheres can be overcome only on the *principled basis of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism*.

Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism, and dedicated and devoted service in the interests of their people, and the common cause of socialism, we read in the Main Document of the 1969 Moscow Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties, are a requisite for the efficacy and correct orientation of united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, a guarantee that they will achieve their historic goals.

Practice, "the course of political developments", as Lenin stressed, is the best way to overcome the differences in the communist movement. For these are "often resolved by those with incorrect opinions going over in fact to the correct path of struggle, under the pressure of the course of developments that simply brush aside erroneous opinions, making them pointless and devoid of any interest". He insisted that adopted decisions should be verified "as often as possible in the light of new political events".<sup>1</sup>

At bedrock of Party relationships are proletarian internationalism, solidarity and mutual support, respect for independence and equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Bilateral consultations, regional meetings, international gatherings and exchange of experience—these are the forms of co-operation practised by the fraternal parties.

The international meeting in Moscow in June 1969 was a milestone in rallying the international communist movement. Those taking part declared that the Parties, notwithstanding some differences in viewpoints, affirmed their resolve to act in a united front against imperialism; they expressed the conviction that the difficulties encountered by the movement would be overcome, since its long-term aims and interests are identical, since each Party is striving for a solution to the problems that suits the national and

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 146.

international interests, the revolutionary mission of the Communists.

Expressing their resolve to act jointly against imperialism, for the common aims of the movement they reaffirmed their faith in the inevitable victory of the revolutionary and progressive forces; they called on the peoples of the socialist countries, the working class and all democratic forces in the capitalist countries, on the liberated peoples and on those yet to be liberated to unite in the common struggle against imperialism, for peace, national independence, social progress, democracy and socialism.

Greater than ever before is the responsibility of the Communists for the international struggle against world capitalism, for the victory of socialism and communism throughout the world. And especially great is the responsibility of the Communist Parties in the socialist countries building the new society now taking shape in a large part of the world. Support for and defence of the gains of socialism, achieved at the cost of much effort and selfless labour, is the common international duty of all the socialist countries.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, an internationalist party, regards the building of communism in the USSR as its lofty internationalist duty; it sees itself also as one of the detachments of the international army of Communists and it is doing everything to further the revolutionary movement in the capitalist world and the national liberation movement. The CPSU is a consistent champion of the socialist gains in other countries, proof of which was the international aid, rendered jointly with other socialist countries, to the people of Czechoslovakia in preserving the gains of socialism in the summer of 1968.

The CPSU attaches the greatest significance to educating the Soviet people in the spirit of internationalism and patriotism, its preparedness to uphold socialism throughout the socialist world system, the cause of the international working class and of the working people everywhere. It wages irreconcilable struggle against all manifestations of nationalist ideology, chauvinism, local exclusiveness and separatism, and guards as the apple of the eye the greatest gain of socialism—the friendship of the peoples of the USSR.

## 5. The National Liberation Movement

### Disintegration of the Colonial System of Imperialism

Colonialism, under whose yoke not so long ago languished more than half of mankind, is one of the blackest pages in history. Destruction of countless numbers of people, inhuman exploitation, misery and hunger, illness and lack of education—such was the fate which the colonial adventurers brought upon the people in Africa, Asia and on the American continent. In Africa alone over 100 million people were enslaved or destroyed by the colonialists and all for a single purpose—extraction of maximum profit.

Understandably, the peoples could not put up with the domination of the colonialists. They waged selfless struggle for their freedom and national independence.

The October Revolution, which awakened the oppressed peoples and inspired them to struggle, brought them into the mainstream of the world revolutionary movement and gave a powerful impulse to the national liberation movement. The October Revolution was followed by the onset of the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism. The Soviet Union, the first socialist country in the world, stood out as an example to the emancipation struggle of the peoples and became their reliable bulwark.

In contrast to imperialism which trampled upon the national independence and freedom of the majority of the nations, shackled them in the chains of slavery, the rise of socialism was distinguished by the arrival of the era of emancipation for the oppressed peoples. Since then the mighty wave of national liberation revolutions has swept away the colonial system and undermined the foundations of imperialism. In place of the former colonies and semi-colonies, young sovereign states have come into existence.

The political map of the Asian continent has changed radically. China, India, Indonesia and other countries have emerged from colonial or semi-colonial dependence. In Africa, too, colonialism is on the way out and the national flags are flying over dozens of sovereign states. In the years that have passed since the Second World War over 70 independent states, most of them in the past ten

or fifteen years, have emerged from the old colonial world. In Latin America, for decades under the undivided domination of US imperialism, the peoples are rising in struggle.

Nor is the time far distant when colonialism—that shameful page in history, will be ended for ever. To rid our planet from colonialism, to eradicate its last footholds, to prevent it from operating in new and disguised forms—such are the demands of the times as stated at the above-mentioned International Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow.

*The national liberation movement is a component of the single world-wide revolutionary process of our times.* Its significance for social progress is great indeed. Undermining imperialism, destroying its immediate hinterland, this movement facilitates man's advance from capitalism to socialism. This explains why the Communist and Workers' Parties assessed the disintegration of colonialism as a phenomenon second in its historical significance only to the rise of the world socialist system.

But the job is still far from completion. The imperialists are doing their utmost to resurrect the colonial order, seeking not only to maintain but to intensify the exploitation of the young sovereign states.

Moreover, tens of millions of people (in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia and other countries) are still under the yoke of colonial oppression. Imperialism remains the chief enemy of the national liberation movement, and for this reason the freedom-loving peoples of the world are fully resolved to fight to the end against imperialism, for genuine freedom and independence. To combat the new forms of colonial oppression and neo-colonialism is a major task of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

*Neo-colonialism* signifies the economic, military-political and ideological expansion of the imperialists against the newly-free nations and those still battling for liberation.

Wherever the imperialist powers manage to maintain their grip on the economy of the particular country, they go all out to step up the economic exploitation. And although most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America have

gained political independence, many of them are still dependent economically on the imperialist powers. Many of the industrial enterprises and certainly the bulk of the natural resources of these countries are concentrated in the hands of foreign monopolies, which enables the latter to receive as heretofore fabulous profits from the exploitation of the economically dependent countries.

The aggressive military-political blocs (CENTO, SEATO and others), in which the imperialists have enmeshed a number of countries in Asia and Africa, are instruments of enslavement and new forms of colonial exploitation of the less developed countries.

In the drive against the emancipated nations the imperialists resort also to export of counter-revolution and to direct armed intervention in the internal affairs of these nations. The Anglo-French-Israeli imperialists tried by force of arms in 1956 to bring Egypt to its knees; in 1961 the United States imperialists resorted to aggression against Cuba and are presently waging a criminal war against the people of Vietnam. In 1967 the world witnessed the imperialist-inspired Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples.

No little attention is devoted by the neo-colonialists to ideological aggression. Reactionary bourgeois ideology is used by them in their efforts to maintain and intensify the exploitation of the developing countries.

#### The Character and Motive Forces of the National Liberation Revolution

*The national liberation revolution is the highest phase of the national liberation movement.* The fundamental question of any revolution, including the national liberation revolution,

is that of state power. The transfer of state power from the hands of the foreign monopolies and their agents to the national patriotic forces of the previously oppressed people is the hallmark of the national liberation revolution.

Imperialism, which crushed every manifestation of political and economic independence, had undivided sway in the economy and in the political life of the colonial countries. Foreign monopolies did everything to retard the economic development of these countries and what little development did take place was of a one-sided and deformed nature.

The national liberation revolutions are above all *anti-*

*imperialist*, since they are aimed against the imperialists who enslaved the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries economically, used them as agrarian raw-material appendages, shackled them politically, ruthlessly trampled upon every striving towards political independence and deprived the peoples of elementary democratic rights and liberties. Destruction of monopoly oppression is impossible without abolishing the hangovers of feudalism and tribalism, the pre-feudal relationships whose representatives are the main social support of the imperialists in the colonial and dependent countries. Hence the national liberation revolutions bear also an *anti-feudal character*. And lastly, these revolutions are *democratic in character*, since economic and political independence is unthinkable without participation by the bulk of the population, without democratisation of all aspects of public life.

In all colonial and dependent countries we find in varying numbers a working class and a peasantry, a national bourgeoisie and an urban petty bourgeoisie, an intelligentsia (civil and military), students, feudal lords and a pro-imperialist bourgeoisie.

All these classes and social forces, with the exception of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and the feudal overlords, suffer at the hands of the foreign monopolies and for this reason they, in one way or another, take part in the national liberation revolution of which they are the motive forces. It goes without saying that each of these classes and social groups has its particular views of the revolution and while supporting the common national aims, pursues its own particular aims.

*The working class* is, of course, one of the main motive forces of the revolution and its numbers are growing steadily. One should bear in mind that numerically, in organised strength and in degree of political awareness the working class differs from country to country. However, in all dependent countries without exception the working class, by virtue of its objective position in society, acts as the most revolutionary of the social forces and is much more interested in waging the national liberation revolution to the end. Its aim, and this is understandable, is to abolish the oppression of the foreign monopolies, secure democratisation of all public life and create favourable conditions

for realising the historic mission of the working class, namely, socialism.

In the course of the national liberation struggle the working class becomes stronger, more organised, and acquires political experience. Its class consciousness is deepened and its alliance with the non-proletarian sections of the working people takes shape and gains strength. Trade unions, the organisations of the youth and women likewise grow in numbers. For the working class the national liberation revolutions are schools for the coming social struggle for socialism.

In some countries with considerable peasant populations the *peasantry* acts as the main driving force of the national liberation revolutions. The peasantry, too, has a special interest in abolishing the ownership of the monopolies, of the local tribal and feudal chiefs, in obtaining the opportunity to till the soil and enjoy the fruits of its labour. Understandably, it is an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal force with a vested interest in ending the political and economic domination of foreign capital and the rule of tribal and feudal chiefs, in a word, in bringing about an agrarian reform.

That part of the bourgeoisie with an interest in the economic development of the country and which actively participates in the national liberation revolution, especially in the fight for political independence, is known as the *national bourgeoisie*, to distinguish it from the pro-imperialist, anti-national (sometimes described as *compradore*) bourgeoisie which, being tied up with the foreign monopolies, betrays the common national interests.

Participating in the national liberation revolution from the standpoint of its own class interests, above all from the standpoint of capitalistic national-economic development and of having a share in running the country, the national bourgeoisie also expresses some of the general national interests, since its particular class aims cannot be achieved without liberation from the yoke of foreign imperialism and local feudalism. While the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal aspirations of the national bourgeoisie lead to a fusing of its interests with those of the nation, it fears the revolutionary working class and peasantry, seeing in them a threat to its interests as an exploiter, and, for this reason,

endeavours to restrict the revolution to the narrow confines of its own class interests, to retard its development and take it along the capitalist way.

Fairly numerous and influential in the colonial and dependent countries, particularly in Africa, are the so-called *intermediate petty-bourgeois sections* (handicraftsmen and small traders, chiefly engaged in retail trade, and others). Socially speaking, the status of these sections is highly contradictory. On the one hand, they are property owners, although, as a rule, theirs is small property, and to a degree this brings them closer to the bourgeoisie; on the other hand, being obliged to work for a livelihood they are drawn closer to the workers and even more so to the peasantry. Moreover, like other working people they are subjected to merciless exploitation both by the foreign imperialists and by the local rich. It hardly needs saying that in their overwhelming majority these intermediate sections are radical in outlook, take part in the national liberation revolution and have a stake in its complete victory.

A significant and at times a leading role in the national liberation revolution is played by the *national-democratic intelligentsia*—professional people, part of officialdom, forward-looking officers, students and office employees. The role of this section is particularly pronounced in those countries where a working class has not yet appeared on the arena as an independent force, while the national bourgeoisie is either without influence or pursues a pro-imperialist policy, as is the case in most of the African countries. In situations of this kind the intellectuals frequently come to the fore both in the revolution and afterwards in the new state.

Such, in general outline, are the motive forces of the national liberation revolution. The relationships and the role of these forces in the revolution are not identical in the different countries by virtue of differences in their histories and in levels of socio-economic development. The relationships change accordingly as the revolution develops in these countries.

So that in attempting an analysis of the motive forces of the revolution in a particular country it is essential to see it in the *concrete-historical* context and with due account for the internal and external conditions.

**Economic  
Independence—  
a New Stage in the  
Revolution**

Gaining *political independence*, that is liberation from the political rule of imperialism, makes up the content of the initial phase of the national liberation revolution. In this phase, now completed in most developing countries, the state power of the foreign imperialist bourgeoisie and the local feudal chiefs or tribal families was transferred to the patriotic forces of the nation. The rise of new national sovereign states in Asia, Africa and Latin America is among the main political results of the disintegration of the imperialist colonial system.

Political independence, however, is not the sole aim of the national liberation revolution. The gains must be consolidated, an end put to the dependence on foreign monopolies, since *without this economic independence is unthinkable*.

The imperialists did all in their power to perpetuate their domination in the colonial and dependent countries in order to bind them to their own economic and political system, and they nipped in the bud every attempt, even the slightest, by the oppressed peoples to develop their own national economies and especially industry.

For generations imperialism retarded development in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America whose economic levels are, with rare exceptions, at very low levels to this day. The developing countries, inhabited by 71.3 per cent of the population of the non-socialist world, account for 11.8 per cent of industrial output and 9.3 per cent of the manufacturing industries of that part of the world.

It goes without saying that only by freeing their economies from the grip of the foreign monopolies can the developing countries use in their own interests the vast natural resources, *work for themselves and for their people*. To be able to do this there is but one way—the way of *national economic development*. So long as they remain in economic dependence on imperialism the peoples of the liberated countries will not be able to take the way of socio-economic progress. What is more, economic dependence is an ever-present and grave threat to their political independence.

*Economic dependence, then, is the content of the second phase of the national liberation revolution.*

*Nationalisation* is one of the most radical means of freeing the economy from dependence, that is the taking over by the state of industrial enterprises, means of transport and communications, the banks, trading and municipal enterprises and the educational establishments. Nationalisation involves the rise of a state sector in the economy.

With conditions making it impossible for developing countries immediately to nationalise all or at least a major part of the property owned by foreign monopolies, it is possible for them in the meantime to exercise, jointly with the nationalisation, a measure of control over the operations of the monopolies and restrict their opportunities to exploit the people and the national resources. In many countries we observe the formation of mixed enterprises with ownership shared by the state and private capital, including foreign capital. But the surest way to economic independence lies through *industrialisation*.

Industrialisation makes it possible to modernise all branches of the economy, including agriculture, and to achieve greater labour productivity. Industrialisation serves to strengthen the defence capacity of the country and provides the base for the progress of science, technology and culture. Industrialisation alone makes it possible to overcome the inherited backwardness of the liberated countries, to rid them of the unseemly role of being agrarian-raw-material appendages to the imperialist countries and to gain genuine independence. And lastly, industrialisation is an important precondition for raising the standard of living.

But not all the developing countries have the resources needed for this. Their immediate worry is to find the wherewithal with which to provide the people with food and clothing, with jobs and housing and to use the materials to hand and set about building industrial enterprises. Be that as it may the task of creating a modern industry confronts each of these countries, since without it genuine independence is ruled out. For the smaller countries the development of all the branches of industry is much too onerous an undertaking. For this reason they attach great significance to specialisation and co-ordinated production, and this presupposes reinforcing their unity, extending their economic contacts, engaging in trade with one another and

with all other countries, including in the first place the socialist countries.

Many of the newly-liberated countries are now taking the first steps towards industrialisation. Relying on their internal resources and aided by socialist countries, they are building a fuel and power base, modern industries and especially those branches of special significance to them and which facilitate their achieving economic independence.

Vital, too, in this respect is solving the *agrarian problem* in favour of the people, a far-reaching agrarian reconstruction. At the heart of this matter is ending foreign landownership, the feudal and pre-feudal relations in agriculture, thus enabling the peasant cultivator to till this land.

Agrarian reconstruction can, and does, assume varying forms. In a number of the newly-free countries extensive reforms are under way aimed at restricting the scale of landownership and turning over the confiscated land to the working farmers. *Co-operative farming*, the beginnings of which we observe in some liberated countries, is a more radical form of the agrarian reconstruction. In many of these countries the agrarian question is still far from being solved and to this day it is one of the main tasks of the national liberation revolution.

#### Ways of Development of the Newly-Free Countries

Choosing the 'pathways' of development for the liberated countries is an important matter, around which different classes and political parties conflict by offering their particular solutions. The reactionaries, including (and chiefly) the big bourgeoisie and big landowners, anxious to preserve their privileges, their private property and exploitation, want the nation to develop along capitalist lines. In this they rely on the economic and military backing of imperialism.

On the other hand, the progressive forces, in the first place the working class and working peasantry, seek to take their country along the road of genuine independence, prosperity and progress.

Capitalism is hated in the liberated countries. All too fresh in their memory are its horrors and they know well the price paid for their freedom. Experience teaches that capitalism and imperialism signify wars and colonial enslavement, exploitation and unemployment, misery and hunger.

And because it is the enemy of democracy and social progress capitalism, no matter how attractively it is dressed up, whether in the garb of "people's capitalism" or the "affluent society", is strongly rejected by the peoples.

But there is another way of development—the *non-capitalist way*. What is this way, what does it promise the liberated peoples?

#### The Non-capitalist Way

The possibility of one-time backward countries going over to socialism without passing through the capitalist phase and capitalist industrialisation was associated by Lenin with the rise of socialism in the more developed countries whose working class is called upon to extend all-round aid to the peoples backward in their economic and political development. "...With the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries," Lenin wrote, "backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage."<sup>1</sup>

At present Lenin's thesis about the possibility of the non-capitalist way for the less developed countries is being translated into life. Of the 65 million non-Russians in the population of Russia in 1917 some 25 million lived in the outlying colonial regions of Central Asia at the pre-capitalist stages of development, with a feudal mode of production and a tribal way of life still in existence. Now fifty years later these outlying regions have turned, with the aid of the fraternal nations and of the Russian nation in the first place, into prospering socialist republics with modern industry and agriculture and a high level of culture. The pathway from feudal backwardness to socialism has been traversed by the previous semi-colonial Mongolia which, aided by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, sees itself in the near future as a highly developed industrial-agrarian country.

This experience of the Central Asian Soviet republics and of Mongolia shows most strikingly what can be done by previously backward peoples when they gain liberation from colonialism and exploitation and when they benefit from the aid of fraternal nations. This experience, now

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

being studied by the liberated peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, shows that it is possible to avoid the torments of the capitalist path and that the non-capitalist way is the highway to genuine independence and progress.

What does the non-capitalist way imply?

The transition to socialism takes place, as we know, as a result of the socialist revolution; and needed for this are certain material and class prerequisites (the corresponding level of economic development, the presence of a developed and politically active working class headed by its Marxist party, and others). As a rule, these preconditions set in during the capitalist phase, which explains why a direct transition to the socialist revolution is possible in the developed capitalist countries.

Things are different in countries still in the pre-capitalist phase, and most of the young sovereign states are in this category. Here the preconditions for the socialist revolution have not yet matured and for this reason the transition to socialism requires a definite period of preparation in the process of which the material and class conditions for going over to socialism take shape. This preparatory phase, in the course of which the *advance to the decisive socialist transformations* takes place, is basic to the non-capitalist development.

The socio-economic processes taking place in this initial phase (economic growth and the appropriate realignment of class forces in favour of the working masses and chiefly the industrial working class) are in a way not unlike those typical for the capitalist way. But in the conditions of the non-capitalist way these processes take place much more quickly and, what is more, the people (and this is the main thing) are in very large measure spared the torments that accompanied the rise of capitalism. During this initial phase of the non-capitalist way one can observe alongside reforms of a bourgeois-democratic nature changes of a socialist nature (restriction of private capital and of exploitation, transfer of part of the means of production to public control, planning, and so on), though these measures do not as yet play the decisive role nor do they determine the socio-economic contours of society as a whole.

Clearly the ratio of the bourgeois-democratic and socialist changes in this early phase of the non-capitalist way is not

identical everywhere and the same can be said about its relative weight and significance in the different countries, since these depend on the level of economic and social development and on the balance of class forces at the time. Still, irrespective of their depth and of their forms the socialist changes are a clear indication of the non-capitalist way, while the absence of changes of this nature would be a sure sign that society is still stuck in the same old capitalist groove.

This initial stage, in which bourgeois-democratic changes predominate, is succeeded by decisive socialist changes in all spheres of public life, that is, by the stage of direct transition to socialism. Socialist changes now acquire decisive significance, the non-capitalist way takes a firm hold and society finally steps out along the highway of socialist development. What takes place now is the *growing over of the national liberation revolution into the socialist revolution*. The onset of this new stage will depend on how actively the masses participate in the revolution, on the degree of democratic changes in public life and the state apparatus, on how quickly the role of the working class grows and reinforces its alliance with the peasantry, on how firmly the leading core of the revolution becomes the champion of the working people's aspirations and adopts the standpoint of scientific socialism.

We see, therefore, that the socio-economic content of the non-capitalist way is reduced to rounding-off the national liberation revolution, to creating the material and class preconditions for building socialism and, lastly, to the growing over of the national liberation revolution into the socialist revolution.

Expressing the will of the masses, their striving for socialism and for a new and better life, the leaders in a number of the liberated countries (Egypt, Syria, Burma, Guinea, Algeria, and others) have announced the desire of their peoples to opt for the non-capitalist way. In these countries measures of an anti-capitalist character are being carried out. They include: establishing a state sector by way of nationalisation, a gradual introduction of economic planning, industrialisation, an agrarian reform—in particular the beginnings of co-operative farming—gradual squeezing out of foreign capital, and restricting

exploitation and the influence of the exploiting classes in political life. An independent anti-imperialist foreign policy is proclaimed and friendly relations and co-operation are established with the socialist countries.

Special attention is devoted to improving the well-being and culture of the peoples, to education, public health and the training of scientific and technological personnel.

True, the national liberation movement has its difficulties and its contradictions; the reactionaries essay a comeback and at times they are successful; in some of the countries there are moments of extreme instability. In their totality these developments are due chiefly to the inherited economic and cultural backwardness. The agrarian character of the country, as a rule, its one-crop economy, its dependence on foreign capital which, tying the hands of the progressives, makes it impossible for them consistently to pursue an independent policy. Progressive policies evoke the frantic resistance of local reactionaries—tribal chiefs, feudal lords, the bourgeoisie dependent on foreign capital, and the reactionary military. To this should be added the blatant interference by the foreign imperialists who, in combat with the progressive forces, do not hesitate at armed intervention.

And last but not least, the national liberation movement frequently lacks the leading role of the working class—the most revolutionary force of the times capable of consistently advancing the revolution. In some of the developing countries the working class is numerically small and inadequately organised, in others it is only just taking shape and making its first steps in political life; in still others there is no working class. However, with the growth of industry which, with varying degrees of intensity, is under way in all the developing countries, a working class is being formed and its role is growing and the beginnings of its alliance with the non-proletarian sections and especially with the peasantry can be observed.

In this is the guarantee that, sooner or later, the young sovereign states will, with the aid of the socialist countries, confidently step out along the socialist way. For it is the working class that personifies man's transition from capitalism to socialism. In equal measure this is true also of the socialist countries where the working class is at the helm

of state and also for the developed capitalist countries where the working class is in the van of the revolutionary struggle against capital, and for the developing countries where it is called upon to assume the leading role in the struggle of the peoples for their socialist future.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM

#### 1. The General Laws and the Specific Forms of Building Socialism

Socialism is based on the achievements of the industry and technology, the science and culture of capitalism; it is built by people who by and large have grown up and received their education under capitalism. It is, however, a qualitatively different kind of society.

The economy, social relationships and culture of capitalism, based on private ownership and exploitation, are designed to serve the interests of the small minority who own the means of production, whereas socialism, based on public ownership and co-operation and mutual aid between people, is a society of the working people, for the working people. It will be appreciated that the building of this new society is unthinkable without a really fundamental reconstruction of social life in all its aspects. But, and this is the nub of the matter, the reconstruction encounters the frantic resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes and, above all, of the capitalists.

And to overcome this resistance and effect socialist transformations in the economy, in social relationships, education and cultural life and to put these at the disposal of the people of labour, a period of transition from the old to the new society is needed.

This transition embraces the period when the old ruling class is deprived of power but nevertheless continues to offer resistance to the victorious working class, the period when capitalism is not yet abolished completely, but a new society is reconstructed in the direction of socialism.

"The state of transition... from the old to the new,"

Lenin wrote, "is a state of growth of what is new."<sup>1</sup> It is the period of socialism coming into its own, a period of struggle between the outgoing capitalism and the rising socialism.

The experience of building socialism in the USSR and in other countries enables us to affirm that the basic regularities encountered in establishing the new society are not something transient. They will of necessity repeat, given the corresponding conditions, in other countries taking the socialist way. Hence they acquire the significance of general laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism and they include: the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat exercised in various forms, the leading role of the Communist Party, socialist nationalisation and industrialisation, economic planning based on public ownership and on modern science and technology, and also co-operative farming and the cultural revolution.

These general laws are not, of course, manifested in identical fashion in the different countries. Each has its own conditions—differing levels of economic development and culture, its own history, natural conditions and resources, its particular class relationships and national features and traditions of its people, and so on. Nor are the international conditions identical in which the building of socialism takes place.

It follows, then, that in each country the transition from capitalism to socialism will have its own specific features. "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable," Lenin wrote, "but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."<sup>2</sup> The ways of building socialism in any country concern not the substance but the forms and methods employed, the rate and intensity of the socialist reconstruction. In no way do they abrogate the general laws.

For the opponents of scientific socialism, communism, the anti-socialists and the revisionists who scorn the existence of the general laws, the national features are what matter.

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 70.

Elaborating a whole variety of "patterns" of socialism they deny the international character of Marxism-Leninism. The chief targets of their attacks are the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party—in building socialism. We observed this, for example, in Czechoslovakia in 1968 where the anti-socialist forces tried to oust the Communist Party and the socialist state from the leadership of society and to give free rein to a political opposition and in this way undermine the base of socialism. But the working people of Czechoslovakia, aided by the fraternal socialist countries, repelled this onslaught.

Let us take a closer look at the general laws and the different forms of building socialism in particular countries.

## 2. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Leading Role of the Communist Party Are Decisive for Building Socialism

The essentials for building socialism are, one, the dictatorship of the proletariat and, two, the leading role of the Communist Party. To express it in another way, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party—are among the major laws governing the building of the new socialist society.

The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the result of the successful socialist revolution, of the dismantling of the old, capitalist machinery of state. This is an entirely new kind of state, differing radically from all previous states chiefly in its class nature and in the role which it is called upon to play and also in the forms assumed by the state organisation.

All previous types of state, being the instruments of the exploiting classes for keeping the working people in subjection, pursued the aim of maintaining human exploitation and of perpetuating the division of society into oppressors and oppressed. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule of the working class which, together with all the working people, abolishes capitalism and replaces it with the new society without hostile classes and exploitation.

What are the basic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

Throughout the transitional phase the class struggle continues without let-up. The defeated exploiting classes, deprived of political power, refuse to become reconciled to their fate, to their loss of power and privileges and for this reason they offer frantic resistance to the new power. Proletarian dictatorship is necessary chiefly for the purpose of breaking this resistance and of providing the people with the means to defend and consolidate the revolutionary gains against all encroachments by internal and external enemies.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat," we read in the Theses of the Central Committee of the CPSU on the centenary of the birth of V. I. Lenin, "is the main instrument in the building of socialism. It enables the working class, all working people to counter the power of capital, the many connections of the bourgeoisie, its experience in administration, its private-property ideology and psychology with the power of proletarian conviction, class consciousness, organisation and discipline."

Such is the *first task of the dictatorship of the proletariat*—coercion in relation to the overthrown exploiters.

Suppression of the bourgeoisie, however, is not the sole aim of the proletariat. Its function is to begin the building of the new society, in the first instance the socialist economy. The difficulty here is that the revolution takes place without any ready-made blue-prints of socialism. So that to the new proletarian state falls the lot of guiding the economic life of society, of creating the new economy of socialism resting on public ownership, of creating the new social relationships and educating the working people in the spirit of socialism. And not only to build socialism and guide it in a planned way, but also to defend it against encroachments by the internal reactionaries and against possible aggression on the part of international imperialism.

Such is the *second, constructive and managerial task of the dictatorship of the proletariat*.

The building of the new society is undertaken by the working class in a close alliance with the non-proletarian masses, in the first place with the peasantry. What is more, in the process of combating the bourgeoisie and in building socialism the working class re-educates these masses.

And this is an extremely difficult undertaking, much more difficult and delicate than the straight fight against the bourgeoisie. For needed here is painstaking and diligent educational work to convince the non-proletarian sections of the population of the advantages of socialism. In this undertaking the working class also educates itself and the end result is a really big change in the entire intellectual life of society.

Such is the *third, educational task of the dictatorship of the proletariat.*

In addition to these, so to speak, national tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat there is a vital, specifically international task too: in every way and chiefly by the example of its successful economic upbuilding the proletarian dictatorship furthers the revolutionary struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries to whom it renders political, material and moral support. In this way the proletarian state makes its contribution to the world revolutionary process, to abolishing capitalism and the affirmation of socialism on a world scale.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, *a new and higher type of democracy*, signifies democracy for the overwhelming majority of the people. This democracy derives from the very nature of the proletarian state, from its aims and from the functions which it fulfils. To abolish exploitation, end the anarchy in production, the economic crises, unemployment and misery of the masses, to ensure planned and rapid economic growth, to raise steadily the standard of living—needed for these is the participation of large masses of people. Consequently, the alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian sections of the population in town and countryside, and above all with the peasantry, with the working class playing the leading role—this alliance is the very heart, or the supreme principle, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the fullest and all-round expression of the truly genuine democracy of the proletarian state.

The dictatorship of the proletariat heralds the arrival of the genuine rule of the people. For proof of this let us compare, for example, the composition of the supreme bodies in the German Democratic Republic and in Federal Germany.

In the GDR People's Chamber 43.2 per cent of the deputies are industrial workers; 14.2 per cent peasants and farm

workers; 14.7 office employees; 23.8 intellectuals; and 1.4 are people of different professions.

In the Bundestag in Bonn 32.3 per cent are industrialists; 10.6 are big landowners; 25.7 are business executives; 8.12 are members of liberal professions; 3.8 handicraftsmen; 18.4 office employees and 1.0 per cent industrial workers.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a system of government and non-government (party and social) organisations. Its centrepiece, so to speak, is the Communist Party which directs the building of socialism. During the transitional phase the Party, with its knowledge of the laws of social development and through the government and non-government organisations heads the struggle against the overthrown exploiting classes and guides the socialist reconstruction. The close contact established in the course of the fight against capitalism merges into a unity of Party and people, and this unity is the guarantee of success in building the new, socialist society.

The place occupied by the Communist Party in the system of proletarian dictatorship and in building socialism has been, and still is, the source of conflict between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism; the opportunists are totally opposed to any leading role by the Party in building socialism and communism. Channeled in the same direction are the efforts of the "Lefts", particularly the present Chinese leadership who, in effect, seek to liquidate the Party of the working class and replace it with a party of petty-bourgeois revolutionism. This is also the line of the Right opportunists. Under the false flag of safeguarding democracy and freedom from an alleged dictatorship of the Party, and calling for the "liberalisation" and "democratisation" of socialism, they try to discredit the Communist Party and to oust it from the leadership of society.

But the fifty years' experience of the Soviet Union and the experience of other socialist countries provide the proof and the confirmation of the truth of the Leninist teaching on the leading role of the Party; this experience shows that without the leadership of the Communist Party the building of the new society and the affirmation of genuinely socialist democracy are unthinkable.

It follows, therefore, that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the Marxist party are vital

to the transition from capitalism to socialism. However, depending on the concrete historical conditions in one or another country the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat may be different. In the Soviet Union it was realised in the shape of the Soviets, and in other socialist countries in the shape of people's democracy. As distinct from the Soviets, people's democracy in a number of countries (Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland and others) has a multi-party system, retains the traditional parliamentary forms (the National Assembly in Hungary, the Sejm in Poland, and so on), and possesses a People's (National) Front—a broad mass organisation catering to the most varied sections of the population and, under the leadership of the Communist Party, taking part in building socialism. Moreover, people's democracy did not deprive the exploiting classes and other non-working sections, with the exception of war criminals and their accomplices, of political rights.

A somewhat special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat can be observed in Cuba. So far Cuba has not had a general election in the usual sense and has no elected local government bodies akin to the Soviets. The socialist reconstruction there is being carried out by the revolutionary government under the leadership of the Communist Party. This system of state power bears the hallmarks of the specific conditions in which the revolution took place and of the need to defend the country against aggression by US imperialism.

This difference between the Soviets and people's democracy in no way alters the substance of the political power, since in each case the power belongs to the working class. It can be assumed that in the future, too, we shall see still other forms of proletarian dictatorship. Moreover, it is possible that the dictatorship of the proletariat will be established in different ways—peaceful and non-peaceful. In Russia, for example, it came about as a result of armed struggle, supplemented by a civil war. This was because the deposed bourgeoisie took to arms against the new power and called in the armed intervention of the foreign imperialists. In these circumstances the Russian working class had no choice but to take to arms in defence of their gains.

Matters were different in the other European socialist countries. The main forces of the counter-revolution (the nazis and their accomplices) were defeated here in the course

of the war, which explains why the overthrown bourgeoisie lacked the strength to put up an armed resistance to the new power. Nor did the imperialist powers risk military intervention against the liberated countries, since the latter were under the powerful defence of the Soviet Army. For these reasons the dictatorship of the proletariat in the East European countries was established without civil war. But here, too, the class struggle had, on occasions, acquired sharp forms, and the working class had to take to arms and to rely on the aid, including military support, of its class brothers in the other socialist countries (Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968).

From what has been said it will be seen that the dictatorship of the proletariat does not deny outright all previous forms and more particularly the parliamentary forms of statehood, nor does it dissolve all non-Communist parties and organisations. It does, however, reconstruct these forms, placing many of these organisations in the service of the working people. Although it is the leading force in society the Communist Party does not reject co-operation with any other party or organisation ready to take part in the socialist reconstruction. True, it acts against any political opposition seeking to undermine socialism. The Communist Party, strictly guarding the unity of its own ranks, denies the right of existence to factions and groupings opposed to and working against its general line, the line of building socialism.

This variation in the advance to socialism in the different countries shows that the revolution has no ready-made schemes valid for all time and all places, shows that the revolution is something very concrete, living and constructive.

### 3. Economic Transformations

**Socialist  
Nationalisation**

The economy is the base of social life and for this reason the economic restructuring, and chiefly the change from private capitalist ownership of the means of production to socialist, public ownership, acquires a decisive significance during the transition period. And it is here that the socialist nationalisation plays an extremely important part.

*Socialist nationalisation signifies expropriating the bourgeoisie and turning over to the proletarian state the main means of production—industry, transport, power stations, shipping, the banks, big agricultural and training enterprises. This means the revolutionary abolition of large-scale capitalist ownership and its replacement by public ownership. This nationalisation is of the utmost importance because it gives the state control of the commanding heights in the economy, a control which enables it to influence, on behalf of the working people, the economic development of the country, to organise management of the economy and of the other social processes, including accounting, to plan production and distribution and thus ensure the country's economic independence.*

In this way there arises *the socialist sector* resting on public ownership, a feature of which is production relationships of co-operation and mutual aid and also a system of distribution according to work performance. Within the framework of this new sector the state does away with exploitation, eliminates the contradiction between the social character of the production and the private form of its appropriation typical of capitalism, while the spontaneity and feverishness gradually yield to planned management. In the nationalised enterprises the socialist state acquires a solid economic foundation which, in the course of the advance towards socialism, is extended and consolidated.

Depending on the concrete conditions the nationalisation can be carried out directly or through transitional stages.

State capitalism, which assumes a variety of forms, is one of the stepping stones to *nationalisation*. It can take the shape, for example, of concessions to foreign industrialists and the lease of enterprises to private owners at home, or it can be mixed enterprises, part state and part private. But in this case, too, their socio-economic nature is the same—the enterprises function with the participation of private capital but are always under the control of the proletarian state, meeting its requirements and, in the final analysis, used by it for the purpose of furthering the interests of socialism.

Various types of workers' control over the capitalist enterprises are also the transitional forms of nationalisation. This control is exercised by the workers over the

organisation and management of production, over the hiring and firing of employees, over quality of the production and its distribution, and also over the system of remuneration for labour. For the working people this participation in control is excellent schooling for managing industry and distributing its products, for gaining experience in financing, accounting and so on. The experience gained by the Russian workers in this respect was later taken over by the working people in other socialist countries. For them, too, the workers' councils and factory committees were the stepping stones on the way to nationalisation.

During the transitional phase the land and the property of the big landowners and estate holders are nationalised either wholly or in part. In the Soviet Union, for example, all the land was nationalised and a large part of it was divided among the peasants for their free use in perpetuity. The remainder was taken over by the state and used for state farms. In other countries the land was partly nationalised and partly turned over to the tillers.

Being obligatory for all countries taking the socialist road, nationalisation is effected in different ways. In Russia it was completed in a matter of months (between December 1917 and June 1918). Other transitional forms, particularly state capitalism, were not greatly in evidence here because the defeated bourgeoisie, refusing to become reconciled to their loss, did all in their power to sabotage the measures of Soviet government. It was otherwise in the People's Democracies; there the nationalisation was spread over a period of years. It began by confiscating the enterprises owned by the war-time collaborators and was followed by a gradual nationalisation of other enterprises. The mixed enterprises and other forms of state capitalism were widely practised, and in some countries the previous owners received compensation. In the Soviet Union, due largely to the counter-revolution and foreign intervention, no compensation was paid.

**Collectivisation  
in Agriculture**

For socialism to triumph throughout the national economy reconstruction of the mode of life of the small producers—the peasants—is essential.

How, then, is socialist ownership established in the countryside, in agriculture?

The easiest way, it would seem, would be to nationalise the small holdings and make them state property. But this way, it should be emphasised, is absolutely ruled out. After all, the smallholder, the peasant farmer, though he owns property, is far from being an exploiter. He is a toiler, he sows his seeds and he reaps his crops, which are his livelihood, and for this reason his property cannot be expropriated in the same way as that of the big capitalist and landowner. Moreover, it is necessary to take into account the psychology of the peasant with his attachment to his own plot.

Both the small peasant and the farm labourer take an active part in the revolution in the hope of receiving land and improving their standard of living. And the successful revolution cannot betray their hopes. In the actual process of the revolution much of the land of the big landowners and capitalists is handed over to the tillers, that is to the landless farm labourers, the poor and middle peasants. The result of this, however, is not enlargement of farming but rather its further fragmentation, which explains why after the revolution the numbers of small landholders increase.

Hence, the sole way to the socialist reconstruction of the countryside lies through *co-operative farming*. *The smallholders voluntarily combine into large collective or co-operative farms.*

A major feature of this co-operation is socialisation of labour and of the main means of production. Depending on the degree of the socialisation, the co-operatives can be of different kinds. The Soviet experience and that of other socialist countries has yielded three main forms:

1. Associations for joint cultivation. It is an elementary co-operative; there is no pooling of land and implements; the labour alone is pooled for the usual farm operations.

2. Co-operatives in which implements and labour are pooled, but with the land still remaining the property of the peasants. In most of these income is shared out on a basis of work performance; in the remainder the share-out is based on the amount of land pooled by the co-operative member.

3. The agricultural artel. Here the land, implements and labour are all pooled and work performance is the sole criterion of remuneration. The artel, the highest form of

co-operative farming, predominates in the Soviet Union where it is known as the *kolkhoz*, or collective farm.

Co-operative agriculture has resulted in a gradual disappearance of the small private ownership and, correspondingly, in the spread of socialist ownership. In substance co-operative ownership is similar to socialist state ownership, since it rules out any exploitation and ensures that sharing of the results is based on work performance. One difference, however, is that, as distinct from state property, the property of the co-operative is owned not by all the people but by the members of the particular co-operative. This is known as group socialist ownership.

Pooling labour and the means of production in the co-operatives does not signify the abolition of personal property. A house, household articles, poultry and livestock, and some implements needed in cultivating his personal plot remain in the possession of the co-operative member.

The plan for co-operative farming in the USSR was advanced by Lenin. Its basic principle is voluntary membership. Both Lenin and the Party were against compulsory membership and ruled out any administrative pressure to force the peasants into co-operatives. Convince the peasant, they said, demonstrate to him the advantages of large-scale co-operative farming and he will join of his own volition.

The co-operative plan worked out by Lenin envisaged a gradual socialist reconstruction of the countryside, a switching from the lower to the higher forms of co-operation, the closest attention to the local conditions (geographic, economic, national, etc.); it stipulated genuine democracy in managing co-operatives and a combining of the personal and public interests.

State aid to the co-operatives was another aspect of Lenin's conception, as was reinforcing the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. Assisting the co-operatives with machines and fertilisers, in applying scientific methods, land management, irrigation and other amelioration measures, through state and co-operative trade between town and countryside, the proletarian state encourages growth of farm output and the well-being of the co-operative farmers. Conscious of this aid and support of the government headed by the working class, the peasant responds by giving it his

confidence and respect and by becoming an active partner in building socialism.

Through co-operation the farms are enlarged and they are able to apply all kinds of modern machines, the benefits of science and more rational utilisation of labour and other facilities. Moreover, agriculture comes within the sphere of the overall state planning and management, whereas any conscious administration of the small peasant farming or planning it is unthinkable. Co-operation boosts output. For example, if the gross output of agriculture in the Russia of 1913 be taken as 100, by 1940 in the USSR with the completion of collectivisation it had risen to 141 per cent. And this increase took place at a time of decline in the rural population due to the need for labour occasioned by the rapid industrialisation.

Alongside the co-operatives (*kolkhozes*) there are also state farms (*sovkhozes*) which, of course, come under public ownership.

This combined co-operative and state farming has put an end to the social stratification and to the capitalist elements in agriculture—the kulaks and private traders. The peasantry, formerly a petty-bourgeois class, is now a socialist class. So that in the countryside, too, socialism is coming into its own. Socialist production, therefore, no longer merely one of the economic sectors, is, in effect, growing into a single, all-embracing branch of the socialist system, signifying that the full economic victory of socialism is in sight.

The way in which this social reconstruction is effected is not identical in all socialist countries. In Czechoslovakia, for example, we observe four types of agricultural co-operatives, each differing in degree of socialisation of means of production and labour. In Cuba, vast sugar-cane and other crop plantations have become state-owned farms known as people's estates; these estates account for three-quarters of the sugar crop, for the entire output of industrial crops and for about half the cattle.

**Socialist Industrialisation**      *Socialist industrialisation, implying modern large-scale industry based on the latest achievements of science and technology, is especially vital to socialism in countries with an inadequately developed industry. Here we have in mind*

heavy industry, the backbone of socialist society, which is built during the transition period. "A large-scale machine industry capable of reorganising agriculture is the only material basis that is possible for socialism," Lenin wrote.<sup>1</sup>

The socialist industrialisation is accompanied by steady scientific and technological progress throughout the economy, by the constantly rising productivity of labour and its technical equipment and, consequently, by improved conditions for the working man. It envisages a reconstruction, on the most modern technological lines, of all branches of the economy, the advance of science, technology and culture; it pursues the aim of achieving and then consolidating the economic and political independence of a country and enhancing its defence capacity.

The socio-political impact of the industrialisation is great indeed. It consolidates public ownership in the decisive sphere of the economy, squeezes out the capitalist elements in town and secures the triumph of the socialist sector in industry. It is accompanied by a numerical growth of the working class, enhancing its role and significance in public life and also the influence which it exerts on the other classes and social groups. Consequently, the industrialisation is accompanied by an extension and strengthening of the economic and political foundations of the proletarian state, by consolidation of the positions of the socialist forces in society.

It should be said that both the forms and the methods of the socialist industrialisation differ radically from those of capitalism. Industrialisation under capitalism is, as we know, based on exploiting the working people and on plundering other, less developed countries and very often on military tribute levied on the defeated nations. In contrast the socialist industrialisation derives chiefly from internal accumulation which in turn derives from the higher labour productivity, from economic planning, stringent economy and rational utilisation of labour, raw materials and finance.

Fundamentally different, too, are the purposes of the socialist industrialisation. Whereas the motive of capitalist industrialisation is maximum profit, the socialist industrialisation

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 459.

sation is subordinated in the final analysis to the humane aim of serving the working man, satisfying his needs and furthering his all-round development.

But, as everybody knows, industrialisation is not a simple matter. It calls for very great effort by the people, for considerable outlays, and not infrequently it is accompanied by difficulties and hardships. For the peoples of the Soviet Union who were the first to blaze the way to socialism it was a particularly difficult matter. The country, backward to begin with, had been ravaged by the First World War and the civil war and found itself encircled by enemies who, using every means, from economic blockade to military intervention, were hell-bent on destroying socialism. No loans were forthcoming for the Soviet Union; after all the imperialists grant loans only in exchange for loss of political independence and to that, obviously, the Russian workers and peasants could not agree. It was not for that they had ousted their own capitalists. And having got rid of them they had no desire to fall into enslavement by capitalists from abroad. For them there was but one way: reliance on themselves, on their will, energy and labour. And for the people of the young Russian republic this was a very difficult time; they often went short of necessities but eventually they won through and built a first-class industry which to this day they are steadily developing and perfecting.

The contours of the Soviet Union have changed beyond recognition. Entire branches of industry have been built from scratch, the country has been covered by a network of factories and power stations. Industrial output in 1940 compared with 1913 had risen 7.7-fold, output of means of production 13.4, electric power 24, chemicals 16.9 and machine building and metal working 29.6-fold. From a country which in the past imported machinery, the Soviet Union has turned into a nation that is now exporting highly sophisticated machines and industrial plant. The industrialisation, preparing the way for large-scale co-operative collective farming, supplying the countryside with modern machinery, has greatly enhanced the well-being of the people and the country's capacity for defence.

Other socialist countries, too, have had considerable success in their industrialisation. Their output is growing

and especially rapid is the expansion of those branches forming the base of the national economy and ensuring technological progress (electric power, engineering, chemicals, etc.). The share of these branches in the gross industrial output of CMEA countries amounted to 40 per cent, which nearly corresponds to the level of the most developed capitalist states.

The conditions in which the socialist construction took place in the USSR, and especially the fact that it took place in a single country encircled by hostile imperialist powers, demanded from the people a forced rate of industrialisation, including the expansion of all main branches. Only by overcoming the backwardness and establishing a modern industry, strengthening thereby the defence capacity of the country, was it possible to repel the aggressive forces of imperialism. In this connection, as we have already mentioned, the Soviet people experienced grave difficulties and privations. Fortunately for the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe, they in very large measure were saved from these difficulties. For them there was no great need to force the rate of industrialisation and develop all branches of industry, since they were able to benefit from the socialist international division of labour, from the experience of the USSR on whose aid and the aid of other socialist countries they could rely.

Generally speaking, it can be affirmed that as things are today there will hardly be any need for all countries, and especially for the smaller countries taking the socialist way, to build an entire complex of all branches of modern industry. To attempt to do so would be an extremely difficult undertaking which in any case is no longer necessary and feasible. Nowadays with specialisation and co-operation in industry, with economic integration developed in a big way, the individual countries are in a position to concentrate on particular branches and especially on those for which they have the necessary raw materials and skilled labour. Output of other branches can be imported from the neighbouring socialist countries and partly also from capitalist countries.

Where the matter concerns developed industrial countries, industrialisation is not as urgent as it is for backward agrarian countries. But they, too, are confronted with the

job of bringing their industry into line with all the latest achievements of science and technology.

#### 4. Restructuring National Relationships

A task of the transitional phase is the *socialist reconstruction of the national relationships*. Especially is this the case in those multi-national countries where alongside the dominant nation there are subject nations suffering from oppression. This was particularly the case in pre-revolution Russia where there were dozens of nationalities, big and small.

Capitalist society, based on private ownership and exploitation, is at once a society of national oppression and of the enslavement of some nations by others. The socialist revolution, therefore, is called upon to abolish not only social and class oppression but also the accompanying oppression of nationalities. Socialism, having put an end to exploitation and to the class antagonisms, clears the way for ending national oppression and discord and for a genuine flowering of the nations, for their mutual confidence and rapprochement.

"In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to," wrote Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*. "In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."<sup>1</sup>

Lenin worked out a concrete programme for solving the national question and for the drawing together of the nations. Its basic points were *complete democratisation of public life, genuine equality for all races and nations, the right of nations to self-determination all the way to sovereign, independent statehood, internationalist unity of the working class of all nationalities inhabiting the particular country*. This Leninist national programme, permeated with respect for all nations, big and small, and mindful of their needs and aspirations, helped to rally in a solid alliance the work-

ers and peasants of multi-national Russia led by the working class, an alliance which was one of the main factors in the successful outcome of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia (November 15, 1917), proclaiming the end of national oppression, inaugurated the political and legal equality of the numerous nationalities and ethnic groups. However, emancipation could not be restricted merely to abolishing national oppression and granting the nationalities equal political and legal rights. The main thing was to overcome the centuries-old economic and cultural backwardness inherited from the Russia of the tsars. And this difficult task, too, was tackled and solved by the young socialist state. Not only did it grant the previously oppressed nations the right to free development, it helped them also to overcome their backwardness and to make truly astonishing progress in developing their national economies and cultures.

Once the devastation caused by the imperialist and civil wars had been made good, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government immediately set out on industrialisation in the non-Russian republics. Thanks to the unfailing attention of the Party and the Government, to the selfless help of the other nations and of the Russian nation in the first place, new branches of industry appeared in the outlying areas where development now proceeded with giant strides. Agriculture, too, having changed beyond recognition in the non-Russian republics, is now collectivised and highly mechanised.

These developments enabled the Soviet republics to have their own trained cadres and a numerous intelligentsia. The old-time cultural backwardness has vanished for ever. For, in addition to the radical change in economic life, the peoples also carried out a cultural revolution.

One hundred per cent literacy has been achieved in all the republics, and all of them have their networks of schools, colleges, research institutes, universities and other cultural establishments. A new culture, socialist in content and national in form, is sending down deep roots in all of them.

And so we see that in the actual process of building socialism the former outlying regions of Russia, once agrarian and raw-material appendages to tsarism, have risen to

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 125.

a status of sovereign socialist states with modern industry and a highly productive agriculture, with their own industrial working class and intelligentsia. Backward and illiterate in the relatively recent past, they are now fully fledged *socialist nations* united by identity of economic, political and spiritual interests in a single Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and proletarian internationalism is their ideology.

The Soviet achievement is all the greater because many of the ethnic groups in old Russia took the socialist way without experiencing capitalism. In the course of a single generation they succeeded, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, in making the leap from feudal and even from pre-feudal relations to socialism.

This success in solving the national question—one of the most complex and baffling questions in human history—is a striking manifestation of the triumph of scientific socialism, of proletarian internationalism.

It is the clear and convincing proof that the socialist revolution alone clears the way for the complete abolition of national oppression, for the voluntary union of free and equal nations in a single state, for the genuine flowering of the nations and their drawing together. This experience is now being applied and enriched in other countries of the socialist world who are solving the national problems within their boundaries and also on the scale of the socialist community as a whole.

This experience is useful also for the young sovereign national states liberated from the colonial yoke, and also for those still battling for their emancipation. For them the success of the peoples of the Soviet Union is a source of inspiration and strength in their grim struggle against imperialism and colonialism. In the present of the socialist nations they catch a glimpse of their future.

## 5. The Cultural Revolution

*The cultural revolution, intrinsic to the building of socialism, signifies, in effect, the beginnings of a new, socialist culture, proletarian in its class essence, which replaces the culture of the outgoing bourgeoisie. The victorious working*

class in initiating this new culture by no means throws overboard the old bourgeois culture, rather it takes over all its best achievements and places them at the disposal of the entire people. For only by mastering and critically reworking the culture of the past will it be possible to create the new culture of socialism.

The new society is heir to all the achievements of scientific and technological thought, to works of art and literature distinguished for their liberatory and democratic traditions, to works reflecting the labour and struggle of the people, those that are the hallmark of craftsmanship, the best specimens of the literary language and the classical forms and methods of reflecting reality.

By no means does the moulding of the genuinely socialist culture signify a mere imitation and blind copying of the cultural heritage of the past; it presupposes a careful selection of all that furthers socialism and, by the same token, signifies rejection of all reactionary works and skilful application of the experience of the past to the new conditions. To this day, for example, the Soviet reader studies the literary genius of Tolstoi and Dostoyevsky, learning from them the skilful ability to reflect one or another aspect of social life, deeply to penetrate into the inner recesses of the mind. What he finds unacceptable, however, are the mysticism and irrationalism of Dostoyevsky and the advocacy of non-resistance to evil in Tolstoi.

The cultural revolution stipulates, in addition to assimilating and critically reworking the cultural past, utilising the experience and the knowledge of the old intelligentsia who in its majority served the interests of the ruling classes, re-educating this intelligentsia and winning it for active participation in building the new, socialist society. Moreover, a *new, people's intelligentsia comes into being*, consisting in the main of workers and peasants brought up and educated in the new, proletarian state.

Another aspect of the cultural revolution is its role in the *advancement of public education*. The proletarian state creates a wide network of schools for general education, specialised secondary and higher education and also various kinds of vocational and technical schools, the doors of which are wide open to all working people of town and countryside.

Perhaps the most important undertaking of the cultural revolution is that of *implanting socialist ideology, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism*, organising on this foundation the entire intellectual life of society and training people for their role of active builders of socialism, overcoming the private ownership psychology and ethic, and petty-bourgeois thinking and views.

This revolution will have its place also in the culturally developed countries and in those still backward in this respect. For even in the highly developed capitalist countries a considerable part of the working people are, as a rule, deprived of the opportunity to benefit from culture; their fate is to work and produce profits for the ruling class.

The ruling class has hitherto monopolised intellectual functions and intellectual work. It frequently restricts the education of the working people to that minimum needed to perform particular jobs in industry. In the less developed countries the need for a cultural revolution is plainly obvious. And every one of these countries without exception faces the task of securing victory for the ideology of socialism, the task of the communist education of the working people.

It would be wrong to see the cultural revolution as something which, beginning suddenly, is quickly completed. On the contrary, it is a gradual process necessitating time, painstaking work and skilful organisation. The cultural re-education of society cannot be solved by mere decrees or a stroke of the pen. Important here is that in their mass the people should be conscious of the need for cultural development and that their desire for knowledge and culture be channeled in the right direction. Needed too is a solid material base, a base that will be the product of the socialist reconstruction of the economy, of nationalisation, industrialisation and agricultural collectivisation.

The proletarian state takes over and places at the disposal of the people all educational institutions and all the mass media. It builds up new cultural establishments and takes into its hands the job of educating the working people and of reconstructing in their interest the general and specialised secondary and higher education.

The theorists of the Second International, the opportunists, asserted in their day that without a definite level of

culture, without the presence of intellectuals in adequate numbers, the working class would not be able to take power into its hands. The "uncouth" masses, it was alleged, would not be able to conduct the affairs of state and build socialism.

Lenin, who categorically disagreed with this, pointed out that in the event of the conditions being ripe the working class should not hesitate to take power into its hands and, upon doing so, could set about the job of raising the cultural level of the working people, and all the more so since all the conditions needed for this would be generously provided by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And that was precisely what the working people in Russia and in a number of other countries did. They did not wait until the people had been educated to that higher level which, according to the opportunists, was needed for the conquest of power.

The industrial working class in union with all the toiling people of Russia won power in what was a culturally backward country, a country in which most people were illiterate, since education under the tsars was at an extremely low level. And having won power they worked might and main to overcome the cultural backwardness and they succeeded. By 1937, that is towards the end of the transition period, illiteracy had by and large been abolished in the Soviet Union. The country had been provided with a network of elementary and secondary schools, with colleges and universities, libraries, theatres, museums, cultural centres and so on. By this time the number of school pupils had increased 3.5-fold. The proletarian state did much especially for the education of the peoples in the outlying regions of the country.

Other socialist countries, too, have made remarkable progress in carrying out the cultural revolution. In the pre-socialist Poland, for example, nearly a quarter of the population was illiterate, in Rumania 43 per cent and in Bulgaria 27 per cent; today in most of the socialist countries illiteracy has practically disappeared and this has been accomplished in an exceptionally brief space of time. The people now enjoy the benefits of culture and have access to general and specialised education; the victory of the ideology of socialism is assured and a people's intelligentsia has taken shape.

For percentage of students in total population many of the socialist countries are well ahead of some of the highly developed capitalist states. For example, in the 1969/70 academic year, Bulgaria had 104 students for every 10,000 of the population, the figure for Poland was 99, for the Soviet Union 188, Czechoslovakia 92 and Yugoslavia 117, compared with the 1968/69 academic year in Austria where the figure was 56, in Britain (1967/68) it was 78 and in Federal Germany 48.

It is a matter for regret that the Marxist-Leninist idea of the cultural revolution, is now being distorted and used as a screen for anti-socialist measures. We have in mind here the so-called "great proletarian cultural revolution" in China, which bears no relation whatever to genuine culture and certainly no relation whatever to proletarian revolution. On the contrary, in the course of this "revolution" precious cultural values created by the Chinese nation and other nationalities have been destroyed, outstanding men of Chinese and world culture have been defamed and monuments of the past desecrated. Politically, the "cultural revolution" in China was used as a screen for strengthening the military-bureaucratic rule of Mao Tse-tung and his group, for unrestrained nationalism, chauvinism and anti-Sovietism. This "revolution" has caused grave injury to the cause of socialism in China and threatened the socialist gains of the people.

It follows, then, that the transition from capitalism to socialism is based on general laws manifested in specific ways in the different countries. Strict attention to the requirements of these laws and their skilful application in the concrete historical conditions in one or another country—such is the indispensable condition for the successful building of socialism.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

### SOCIALISM—THE INITIAL PHASE OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Socialism, the first phase of communism, begins where the transition period ends. What are its basic features?

From the *economic* standpoint it presupposes a highly developed production saturated with machinery and gradually automated. In this sphere the basic means of production are public, socialist property and its operation is guided by a single centralised plan. In the process of production the working activity assumes a relationship of co-operation and mutual help; its remuneration is determined by the quantity and quality of the labour put in.

In the *socio-political* sphere, the distinguishing features are the absence of exploiting classes, of human exploitation, of racial or any other kind of social oppression. Identity of basic interests prevails among the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia and among the different nations and social groups. With the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat evolving into a state of the entire people, with the working class playing the leading role, what we term proletarian democracy, democracy for the majority, becomes democracy for all. And as heretofore the Communist Party retains its leading role in society.

In the realm of *ideas* we observe the triumph of the ideology of scientific socialism, of the socialist culture, all doors to which are wide open to the masses who now make the acquaintance of the full range of spiritual values.

At the present time each of the fourteen socialist countries in the world is stepping out along the highway to socialism and communism. Some are laying the foundations of socialism, of its economy and culture, while others are rounding off the building of a mature socialism. As concerns

the Soviet Union, the first of the countries to build socialism, its advance is a gradual ascent to the higher phase of the new society, that is, to communism. Naturally, when talking about socialism and about building communism we turn first and foremost to the experience of the Soviet Union, to its achievements and to its problems. We do so because the road covered by the Soviet Union is now being taken by other countries and, sooner or later, it will be taken by all nations and states.

While socialism and communism are two distinct phases of *communist* society, the two have much in common. Common to each is a highly-developed material and technological base, and common to each in the economic sphere are public ownership of the means of production and the absence of human exploitation.

And with private ownership, exploiting classes and the oppression of man by man completely ruled out under socialism and communism, the production relationships in both one and the other are relationships of fraternal co-operation and mutual aid.

Another feature common to the two phases is the operation of the law of planned and proportional economic development. In both cases the purpose of the socialised production is to ensure the fullest possible satisfaction of the needs—material and spiritual—of the working people; and this purpose is achieved through steady growth of production and its improvement on the basis of higher-level technology.

Also common to socialism and communism are friendship and co-operation between the nations, with preservation and consolidation of peace being the main feature of interstate relations between countries, big and small alike; in each phase all able-bodied members of society enjoy the right to work, each according to his ability, and in both phases the individual and society are as one, and a single communist ideology prevails.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism, taking cognisance of this identity of basic features under socialism and communism, saw them as two *distinct phases (development levels) of one and the same communist society*. "Insofar as the means of production become *common property*," Lenin wrote about socialism, "the word 'communism' is also applicable here,

providing we do not forget that this is *not* complete communism."<sup>1</sup>

This incomplete, still underdeveloped communism is designated as socialism because, emerging from capitalism, it is built on the material inherited from capitalism and, naturally, bears traces of it, "the birthmarks" of the old society. Among these there are, for example, hangovers of the old division of labour, the absence of full economic equality and survivals of the past in the minds of people and in their attitudes.

Let us now look more closely at some of the specific features of socialist society, beginning with its economic organisation.

### 1. The Economy of Socialism

*Common socialist ownership*, in harmony with the social nature of production, forms the base of the economy of socialism. In the USSR and in most of the other socialist countries there are two kinds of common ownership—public and co-operative. The first mentioned derives from the socialist nationalisation and is the property of all the people, the second has its source in co-operation in production and belongs to groups or collectives of people who are members of a particular type of co-operative. Public ownership occupies the foremost place in the socialist economy firstly because it embraces the decisive branches (heavy industry, fuel and power, transport, etc.), and secondly because it greatly exceeds co-operative ownership in development levels and in degree of socialisation of the means of production.

Corresponding to these are two types of socialist undertakings: state-owned enterprises (factories, state farms, etc.) and the co-operatives—the collectively owned property of peasants and handicraftsmen. The two types, as with the undertakings within the two types, are linked economically through commodity-money relations which, of necessity, are intrinsic to the socialist society.

Public socialist ownership does away with the division

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 471.

of people into rulers and ruled, precludes any exploitation of man by man and establishes production *relationships of friendly co-operation and mutual help*.

This signifies that the means of production, and, consequently, all the production and all the material and spiritual values belong to the people, signifies also the profoundly humanist aim of socialist production which is: *ever fuller satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the working people*. This purpose is the very opposite of capitalist production, which is pursuit of maximum profit. The capitalist is not overmuch concerned with what he manufactures, be it atom bombs or foodstuffs; his sole concern is profit and the bigger the better. Socialist production, on the other hand, not being designed to enrich the handful of the privileged, has for its purpose satisfying the needs of the people.

This can be seen from the example of the fifty odd years of Soviet power. Between 1913 and 1970, taking into account the ending of unemployment and the shortening of the working day, real income per worker in industry and in the building trades rose more than eightfold, while real income per peasant for the same period showed a rise of twelvefold. A vast housing programme is under way all over the country. In the one year 1969, for example, 2,280,000 flats were built, providing accommodation for 11.2 million people.

With socialist ownership a level of production has been reached to enable application of the socialist distribution principle: from each according to his ability, to each according to his work. "He who does not work (that is, if he is able-bodied) neither shall he eat", such is the immutable law of socialism.

All able-bodied members of society are obliged to work and enjoy the equal right to receive remuneration from society in accordance with the quantity and quality of work performance. Socialist property and the principle of distribution that flows from it do away with the division of people into a small minority of exploiters and the overwhelming majority of the population whose fate under capitalism is to toil for the benefit of others and who very often have no guarantee that their vital needs will be met.

Distribution according to work done is, understandably

necessary for socialism. It provides the worker with an incentive to work better and it encourages him to brush up his skill, actively to participate in the production process and to improve quality. He who works better receives more accordingly.

Although under socialism all have the equal obligation to work and the equal right to receive remuneration in keeping with the labour expended, this society is not yet in a position to provide full economic equality for all.

The individual producer receives from society in line with his contribution to society, excluding that part which goes into the public fund. There is no longer any class inequality, but there is inequality in the share of goods received by members of society. It will be seen that the principle of equal pay for equal work is the application of an identical measure to people who in many ways are different. People differ in skills and not all are gifted in the same way; families differ in size, so that in remuneration for labour they receive what are, in effect, unequal incomes. This, however, is inevitable in the first phase of the new society, the phase in which it is not yet producing a complete abundance of consumer goods, in which not all its members are at the same levels of consciousness. In this phase, then, an equal wage for all workers is impossible; violating the principle of socialist distribution, it would weaken the material incentive to work.

This is not to say that the economic organisation of socialist society is ideal, that the economy functions smoothly all the time. Many of the difficulties and contradictions encountered are chiefly of an objective character. One should not lose sight of the fact that the building of the new society in the USSR (and in most of the other socialist countries) started from a low level of industrial development, that much energy and time were expended on the armed struggle against internal and external enemies, on restoring the war-damaged economy. Nor should one leave out the experience of building the new society, the insufficiency of material and financial resources, of trained personnel and, of course, the mistakes and failures of a subjectivist kind, associated in particular with the Stalin personality cult, with its dire effects on economic development and on all social relationships.

Truth, they say, is reached through comparison and, generally speaking, that is correct. But snags appear the moment we begin to compare the economic development of socialism and capitalism, say, the USSR and the USA in terms of statistics alone. Clearly levels of industrial development, labour productivity and standard of living of a definite part of the working population in the United States are higher than in the USSR; but then the United States has had well-nigh two hundred years of unhindered development when no enemy soldier appeared on North American soil and not a single building suffered destruction through enemy action. What is more, the big American industrialists have piled up profits from war; indeed, the blood of people of labour has flowed in a golden stream into the coffers of the rulers of capitalist America. To be really convincing any comparison between socialism and capitalism must take into account the point at which socialism began, the conditions in which it set in, how long it has been in existence and its prospects. Given this approach, the comparison will hardly favour capitalism.

If in 1913 on the territory of the old Russian Empire industrial output was but 12.5 per cent of the United States figure, by 1970 it was exceeding 75 per cent. And if in 1913 Russian labour productivity was approximately 11 per cent of that in the United States, by 1970 it had risen to 53 per cent. If in 1950 the national income of the USSR was but 31 per cent of the US national income, by 1970 it had more than doubled this figure, being just over 75 per cent. The average annual industrial growth in the United States for 1951-70 was 4.1 per cent, whereas in the USSR it was 10.1 per cent. And one should not lose sight of the fact that this success has been achieved in a bare thirty years of peaceful up-building.

The Soviet Union, in the past largely a backward agrarian country, has, under socialism, become the world's second greatest industrial power; it is a country with high levels of education and culture, technology and science and with the most advanced social relationships.

In the light of this it is not surprising that this first socialist country in the world was also the first to send up an earth satellite, the first manned spaceship and the first lunar satellite. Nor should one forget that, having built

socialism, the Soviet country is at the moment only at the threshold of communist society.

**Planned Development—  
a Law of Socialism** In contrast to capitalism, socialism was brought about by the people, for the people. That being so, it cannot and does not tolerate the ups and downs of market spontaneity. Public ownership of the means of production unites all producers in a country-wide economy which functions and can only function under the planned guidance of society as a whole in the shape of the state. *Planned, proportional growth is an objective necessity, a law of socialism.*

Public ownership and the identity of producers' interests and aims effected under socialism make it possible to forecast what output, trade and demand are likely to be in the immediate future, to guide expansion of the economy as a whole in keeping with the enunciated aims.

In the process of building socialism the market spontaneity typical of capitalism is replaced by social production organised according to plan and calculated to satisfy the needs of society as a whole and of each of its members. Planning facilitates effective economic guidance on the scale of society, establishes the necessary proportions, ensures a rational allocation of the forces of production and provides the economy with materials, labour and financial resources.

The plan is the result of the most exact calculations. Synchronised with the tasks of building the new society, it plays an *active, transforming role.*

The socialist planning had its beginnings with the replacing of private ownership by socialist ownership. One of its conditions is that the state must be in possession of the commanding heights in the economy—large-scale industry, means of transport and communications, the banks and foreign trade. This condition appeared during the transition period as a result of the socialist nationalisation, industrialisation and co-operation in agriculture. Planning keeps pace with the extension of socialist property and, with the predominance of socialism, gradually embraces the entire economy. At this stage the overall state plan becomes the lode-star guiding the fortunes of the national economy. The market, with its spontaneity, its law of supply and demand, with its free play of prices and its competition, no longer plays its role of the chief regulator in the economy.

## 2. The Class Structure of Socialist Society and Its Political Organisation

### Class Structure

With the advent of socialism the class composition of society undergoes considerable change. Both in the urban and rural communities the exploiting classes, that is the capitalists, landowners, merchants and kulaks (big farmers) are abolished.

Under capitalism there is an antithesis between town and countryside, since the urban bourgeoisie jointly with the big landholders and the merchants (rural bourgeoisie) exploit the working peasant. Socialism, having emancipated both urban and rural workers, has done away with this antithesis.

Under capitalism we find distinctions also between mental and manual labour. The ruling classes with their monopoly of intellectual work use brains for their profit aims, for sweating the manual labour of the worker in the factory and the peasant cultivator on the land. Under capitalism professional people are on the whole obliged to work for the exploiters. Socialism does away with the antithesis between mental and manual labour, since the professional people, now drawn largely from the ranks of the working population, join with the industrial worker and the peasant in the common cause of socialism.

In the Soviet Union, for example, the exploiting classes had disappeared by 1937, the year socialism came into its own. In that year industrial workers and office employees accounted for some 36.2 per cent of the population, collective farmers and co-operated craftsmen for 57.9 per cent, while individual peasant cultivators and craftsmen working for themselves comprised 5.9 per cent. By 1963, however, the figure for the latter categories had declined to a mere 0.1 per cent. So that in the Soviet Union we now have the two friendly classes—the industrial working class and the co-operative farmers, and also the intelligentsia whose outlook during the years of Soviet rule has changed fundamentally.

In other socialist countries, too, the former exploiting classes have all but vanished. In some of them we still observe small numbers of property owners—peasants, shopkeepers and craftsmen. But these can hardly be regarded as

exploiters, since their means of production are small, they go out to work and do not employ wage labour.

Along with abolishing exploiting classes socialism introduces significant changes in the working population. The working class is no longer the old downtrodden proletariat of capitalist days. Jointly with the other groups of the population it owns the means of production and is the genuine master of the country. Industrial expansion is accompanied by the numerical growth of the working class, which in the USSR comprises more than half the working population. The skills and the technical and educational qualifications of the workers have likewise improved, and the content and the nature of their labour have changed. Something like half of all Soviet workers have had a secondary education. Their labour is more productive and growing numbers of them are active in social and cultural life. The work of the skilled man tending the complex machines and engaged in technological processes is approximating to that of the technician and the engineer.

Co-operative agriculture and the cultural revolution have wrought great changes among the peasantry. The old-time isolated and forgotten peasantry, then exploited by landowner and kulak, have become a genuinely free class and a dependable ally of the working class, an active force in society.

The change from working in isolation on his tiny plot to working with his fellows in the co-operative has ended the age-old seclusion of the peasant, has enabled him to overcome his private-property psychology and has developed in him the feeling of belonging, of friendship and comradeship. He is now a much more educated and cultured man. Universal use of sophisticated farm machinery has resulted in peasant cultivators becoming machine operators whose everyday work differs but little from that of the skilled operatives in the factory.

The intelligentsia, too, has undergone a great change. This new, socialist intelligentsia, drawn from the ranks of the people, rewards the latter with selfless service.

The growing importance of the intelligentsia in socialist society is associated with the technological revolution, with the fact that science is becoming a direct force of production.

Some 190,000 specialists with a secondary and higher

education employed in the pre-revolution Russia had risen by the end of 1970 to almost 16.8 million. Millions of teachers, doctors, engineers, technicians, scientists, lawyers and other trained professional people are working for the commonweal. Socialism provides ideal conditions for the intelligentsia, for the application of their skills and knowledge in technology, in exploring and developing the national resources, in social management, education, and in science, literature and art. Socialism, having abolished for ever the class relationships of domination and subjugation, knows no privileged classes or groups. With all members of society being in the same relationship to the means of production, the possibility of exploiting others is wholly excluded. Knowing neither exploiters nor exploited, socialism is the kingdom of working people of factory and field and of social groups for whom class struggle is a thing of the past. In this society a growing socio-political and ideological unity of all the people is under way.

What does this signify?

It signifies, firstly, identity of the basic interests of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia, of classes and social groups, of nations and ethnic groups, all reflecting the *social* structure of socialist society. Secondly, it signifies identity of *political* aims and tasks, equal political rights and obligations. And, thirdly, it signifies identity of ideology, the socialist ideology of Marxism-Leninism. All three components—workers, peasants and intelligentsia—are one in their striving to reach ever higher levels of social development, to arrive at communism with its abundance of material and cultural benefits. This identity enables the members of socialist society to act jointly, in friendship, to overcome even the most formidable difficulties and to undertake tasks of great historic significance. The strength of the tens of millions linked by identity of interests, fused in united action and inspired by the grand ideals of communism, is indeed a mighty and invincible force.

#### The Political Organisation of Society

rule by the people and for the people. In this process democracy for the majority becomes democracy for all, this

Emerging from the proletarian democracy of the transition period from capitalism to socialism, socialist democracy represents a higher type of

being the main distinguishing feature of the political organisation of socialism.

In addition to proclaiming the rights of citizens the socialist society ensures their realisation. All citizens, irrespective of social origin and status, sex, nationality and religion, enjoy the right to work, to rest and recreation, to medical aid, security in old age and in the event of sickness and loss of working capacity, and the right to education. The opportunity for each to use his rights is guaranteed by law and by the steady growth of the socialist state's economic might. The citizen enjoys freedom of speech, of the press, assembly, to hold street processions and demonstrations, the right to join mass organisations of his choice, inviolability of the person, domicile and secrecy of correspondence. Women have equal rights with men in all spheres of public life, including the equal right to work, to leisure, to education and equal pay with men for equal work. Mother-and-child welfare is provided by the state, including grants for large families and for unmarried mothers; maternity leave with pay is provided before and after confinement.

The growth of socialist democracy finds expression also in the enhanced role of the elected representative bodies and of the numerous mass organisations—the trade unions, co-operatives, youth organisations, educational and cultural societies. The process of the gradual evolution of government into public self-rule is on the way.

A striking manifestation of this is the changing over from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat to the *political organisation of all the people, with the working class in the foreground, in other words, the state of the whole people.*

On the way from capitalism to socialism the working class was the dominant and leading class; during socialism and also in the course of advancing towards the higher phase of communism this leading role is retained.

What, it may be asked, entitles the working class to this role?

The title-deeds derive from its being employed in industry, the backbone of the entire economy, from its labour based on the leading and most developed form of socialist ownership, that is, state ownership, ownership by all the people. Moreover, it is renowned for its revolutionary tra-

ditions, for its tempering in class battles against capital and because it is the most consistent champion of the socialist ideology. And, being the most numerous class, well organised and disciplined, it is the most advanced force of *socialist society*. This leading role of the working class will terminate only when society is to arrive at communism, at a completely classless society.

This role of the working class does not detract in any way from the role of the other social forces—the peasantry and the intelligentsia. For the working class cannot pursue merely its own particular aims and interests. Being an indivisible part of the people it expresses their interests and realises their common aims.

Having won for itself prestige and the confidence of the people in its self-sacrificing struggle against the exploiters and in selfless endeavour for socialism, the working class also in the process of building communism acts as the most consistent and the best organised force of the entire people. Its goal is the erasement of class distinctions and the enthronement of the classless society. An ardent champion of patriotism, it is in equal measure deeply committed to the international solidarity of all working people.

Between the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the state of the whole people there are no clear-cut dividing lines, since in substance they are states of a uniform socialist type and their differing forms are but stages in the growth of the socialist state. The socialist nature of the state is not altered by its evolving from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into the state of the whole people, for this is growing and maturing in line with the advance to communism. Its social base—the alliance between the working class and the peasantry—remains and is consolidated; its leading role in society is maintained and socialist democracy is extended. The state of the whole people is the logical continuation of that broad democracy for the working people which, right from its very beginning, lies at the heart of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the socialist phase the state undertakes the management of public life and, what is more, it manages the economy without departing one iota from democratic methods. It hardly needs saying that in this phase there are still law-breakers and anti-social elements, and to cope with them

definite measures of compulsion are retained. But these measures are not to be identified with action to suppress the exploiters, which is a function of the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are aimed not against hostile classes, but against the misfits in society, those still afflicted by hangovers from the past. In effect, the state performs, elaborates upon and improves the basic functions of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat with one exception, that of suppressing the exploiting classes. As a result of the triumph of socialism and the abolition of these classes this function becomes redundant.

The internal political functions of the state as an organ of administration consist in directing the laying of the material and technological base of communism, in transforming the relationships of socialism into the relationships of communism, in supervising the amount of labour and the amount of consumption, ensuring the well-being of the people, safeguarding the rights and liberties of citizens and socialist law and order, protecting socialist property, educating the people in the spirit of conscientious discipline and inculcating a communist attitude to work.

In the sphere of foreign policy the state helps to consolidate the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries and furthers their fraternal co-operation. It fulfils its duty to the international working class, to the peoples everywhere; it assists the working class in its revolutionary struggle in the developed capitalist countries, gives aid and succour to the newly free nations and also to those still battling for liberation. Special attention is devoted to maintaining world peace and normal relations with all countries. And, bearing in mind the danger of attack on the part of the imperialist forces, the socialist state takes care to reinforce the defence capacity of the country and of the socialist system as a whole.

It should be said that the growth of socialist democracy, and particularly in the USSR, was not without its difficulties and setbacks. These were associated chiefly with the Stalin personality cult, expressed in the leading role of one man, which is contrary to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism; associated with departures from the Leninist principle of collective leadership, with unjustified repressions and with other violations of socialist justice, all of which in their totality caused grave injury to Soviet society. But serious though

these deformations were, they did not change the substance of socialist society. The Party and the people, with their profound faith in communism, worked with enthusiasm and, realising the Leninist ideals, overcome the difficulties and setbacks and made good the mistakes.

Opponents of socialism claim that the personality cult is inherent in the very nature of socialism; such claims, however, have nothing in common with reality. This is not to say that the personality cult was without its reasons. The point is that when centralisation of practically the whole of social and economic life becomes excessive it provides opportunities for a concentration of power and, given certain conditions, also for abuse of power, from which it is but one move to the personality cult. But these conditions are not imminent in socialism; they are associated with particular aspects of life in a particular country, with the personal qualities of the leaders. The personal qualities of Stalin (rudeness, intolerance, caprice, etc.) impelled Lenin to warn that, having concentrated in his hands enormous power, Stalin might not be able to use it in the right way; among other things these qualities engendered the personality cult. In the last years of his life Lenin gave much thought to the matter of how to combine centralism with democracy, how to avoid too great a concentration of power in the hands of one man and, all the more so, abuse of power. During those years he closely studied such matters as democratic centralism, collegiate leadership and organisation of public control.

Among the circumstances responsible for the personality cult mention should be made of the difficulties encountered in the building of the new society in the USSR, difficulties associated with the hostile capitalist encirclement and with the need to wage war against the Hitler invasion.

Alien to the very nature of socialism, the personality cult is incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, with the theory of scientific communism, the objective laws of socialist development, with the steady extension of socialist democracy. This explains why the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at its Twentieth Congress in 1956 condemned the cult, took measures to eradicate its consequences and, by so doing, cleared the way for the further democratisation of the socialist system.

In socialist society the development of political organisa-

tion is effected under the leadership of the Party of Communists. In the USSR this party is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leading force in Soviet society and its guiding spirit.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we read in its Rules, is the militant and tried vanguard of the Soviet people, uniting on a voluntary basis the advanced, most conscious part of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and intelligentsia. In the sixty odd years of its existence, the Communist Party, founded by V. I. Lenin, has traversed the glorious and heroic road of struggle and success. It brought the working people to victory in the Great October Socialist Revolution, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, ensuring thereby the complete and final triumph of socialism. This exploit gained for the Party tremendous prestige and confidence of the people.

It now numbers in its ranks nearly 14.5 million members, the most advanced and conscious representatives of the working people of the country. The bulk of the membership is made up of industrial workers and collective farmers, and, in the future, as has been the case from its very inception, the leading place in it will be held by the working class.

In the political arena the Party acts as an international political body expressing the grand friendship and fraternity of the nations of the USSR. All the nationalities found in the Soviet Union are, without exception, represented in its ranks.

The entire policy of the Party and all its work, abroad as well as at home, is subordinated to the interests of the people, to their cherished thoughts and aspirations. This explains why the ideas and deeds of the Party have become the ideas and the deeds of all the people of the country, why both these ideas and deeds are in equal measure understood and endorsed by the worker, the collective farmer and the intellectual, by people differing in age, profession and nationality.

Discharging leading role in society, directing its grand constructive work, the Party with its eyes on the future, points the way forward, awakening public initiative and fostering it in every way. In this unity of Party and people, in the leadership provided by the Party, in its organising

work and in its guidance are the sources of the invincible might of the socialist system.

### 3. Socialism and Its Culture

The new culture of socialism is the product of the cultural revolution following upon the socialist reconstruction of the economy and of the socio-political relationships. Its chief components are the achievements of socialism in education, science, art and literature.

Socialism, which abolishes what can be termed the two cultures typical of antagonistic class society, one for the rulers and another for the ruled, replaces them with a *single culture* of the people to which all have free and equal access. Socialist and internationalist in content and pursuing the aim of consolidating and developing socialism, friendship and co-operation among the working people of the different nationalities, this culture, national in form (in language and other means of expression), which makes it especially prized by each nation, be it big or small, gives access to the intellectual life of other nations, enriching thereby the national cultures and furthering the growth of a common international culture. The ideology of this new culture is Marxism-Leninism, a scientific world outlook, which makes it serve the noble cause of socialism.

The ideologues of capitalism like to boast about the culture and civilisation of their society, about the superiority of capitalist culture. It should be recalled, however, that under capitalism culture and its blessings are mostly for the handful of the privileged, whereas under socialism they are enjoyed by all working people. Each member of the socialist society has the opportunity to acquire an education and to find creative work in industry, science and art. For the working man in capitalist society such opportunity is severely restricted, since creative work is largely the monopoly of the ruling classes. The essence of socialist culture is a profound humanism; it is designed for the working man and serves as a major means for his intellectual growth.

If we turn our attention for a moment to education in the country we will see that whereas the schools in tsarist Russia had an enrolment in 1914/15 of 9,656,000 pupils, the

USSR school enrolment in 1970/71 was in excess of 49.4 million; the corresponding figures for students in the higher educational establishments were 127,000 and 4,600,000, for specialised secondary-school pupils 54,000 and 4,400,000. Taking the entire educational system in the USSR, the present figure for pupils and students is 78,900,000. In one way or another, at one or another level, every third citizen in the country is studying. From these figures we obtain a clear picture of the genuinely popular nature of socialist culture, of the vast scale of the cultural renaissance.

**Socialist Art** Not the least of the results of this cultural revolution is the new, socialist art which, having assimilated the cream of the art of the past, continues its assimilation of the enduring aesthetic values of contemporary art abroad.

This art, with *socialist realism* as its working tool, is first of all a profoundly people's art, imbued with the Party spirit, with revolutionary humanism and civic consciousness; with its true and profound knowledge of life, it makes no concessions whatever to bourgeois ideology and ethics. It reflects the historical path taken by the people, their valiant struggle and their sacrifice in building the new society. It is most demanding in the ideological sphere, being irreconcilable to the decadent and to all that is on the way out; it is all for innovation and for a bold artistic questing, qualities which it combines with making use of everything progressive in world culture of the past and present. It takes, but it also gives, and in the giving it makes its own contribution and a valuable one at that to the treasure-house of the contemporary world culture.

But above all socialist art is wholeheartedly dedicated to the working people. In the most profound sense it is a people's art. Apropos of this Lenin said: "Art belongs to the people. Its roots should be deeply implanted in the very thick of the labouring masses. It should be understood and loved by these masses. It must unite and elevate their feelings, thoughts and will. It must stir to activity and develop the art instincts within them."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *They Knew Lenin. Reminiscences of Foreign Contemporaries*, Moscow, 1968, p. 16.

Socialist art is, as we have said, a realistic art. It is called upon to be truthful, historically concrete and to reflect life in a highly artistic way. Reflecting life in its movement and in its revolutionary development, it helps the working people in the fight against the old, outgoing capitalist world, in the fight for vindication of the new, socialist world. In the best sense of the term, *the Party spirit of socialist art consists in direct service to the working class and to all working people.*

The adversaries of Marxism-Leninism, weighing against the principle of the Party spirit in art, against its class essence, say that these attitudes restrict the artist's freedom and encroach on his individuality. These critics, however, forget that in a class society there is no such thing as a "pure art". Access to art, its appeal, its power to convince and its emotional effect make art a powerful weapon in the class struggle. For this reason the different classes in society use art for the purpose of getting their political, ethical and other ideas across. And far from restricting creative effort, the Party spirit enables the artist to make his contribution towards solving the current social problems and tasks. But the freedom to create, while it is of the essence of socialism, does not entitle anyone to encroach on the interests of society. The artist growing up under socialism sees his civic mission in being an active participant in shaping this new world, a man conscious of his responsibility to his people.

Socialist art, which inculcates in people the loftiest political and ethical qualities, helps them to overcome those relics of the capitalist past that still persist in the outlook of people and in their attitudes; profoundly and truthfully this art portrays the labour and the struggle of the people, opens up the rich spiritual world of contemporary man, his thoughts, his feelings and his aspirations, mercilessly castigates everything that hinders the onward march of society, and it inspires people to do and dare.

Art holds a special place in the aesthetic education of the working people. It reflects the splendour of nature, the rhythm and harmony of its mutations and the wealth and variety of its colour and sound. It lauds the grandeur of man and of human relationships, the grandeur of the labour of man. And the more brilliant the productions and the more the ideological content harmonises with a perfect ar-

tistic form the greater will be their impact. Art that is lacking in ideals, the art of the formalists and the naturalists, is neither uplifting nor possessed of aesthetic quality. Realism, that is a truthful reflection of life, is one of the great gains of man's artistic genius. Realism alone, and especially socialist realism, is aesthetically educative, since it leads the mass of people to an appreciation of art.

In socialist society art enjoys wide popularity, a development which has enabled millions to make the acquaintance of cultural values and cultivate their aesthetic tastes, to develop their own talents through amateur performances.

#### 4. Socialism and the Individual

By ending private ownership and exploitation and by ensuring equal political and legal rights and obligations for all citizens, socialism has created the political conditions conducive to man's reaching full stature. Differences in sex or age, in social origin or occupation, in nationality or religion present no obstacles to the working man finding his place in production and in public life. Having emancipated man from exploitation, socialism makes work—its quantity and quality—the main criterion of man's worth and postulates his place in society. It brings a completely new quality into production the aim of which is the working man, his needs and his interests. And it is this new element that clears the way for his development. The knowledge that he will always find an application for his abilities, that society and production will use his abilities and simultaneously provide for his needs, with the measure of their satisfaction being the quantity and quality of work put in, this knowledge and conviction stimulate the people of labour to improve their skills and advance their education and cultural levels. Socialism, therefore, by inaugurating a new spiritual culture and placing it and the material culture in the service of the working people, provides all the facilities needed for the intellectual and ethical growth of the individual.

Arising from the radical reconstruction of the economy, of social relationships and intellectual life, socialism elevates to higher levels those innate human features which take shape under capitalism and, what is more, engenders new

features of a kind unknown to the man of the old society. In other words, with the affirmation of socialism *a new, socialist personality* appears on the scene.

And of all the gains of socialism perhaps the greatest is the appearance of this new personality, the personality that makes history, the sole master of his society, the sole owner and maker of material and spiritual values, the conscious builder of the new and genuinely human socialist relationships.

The man of socialism appears above all as a worker in socialist production based on common ownership. Among his qualities are diligence, the desire to increase and multiply the public wealth, and friendship and co-operation with all his fellow workers. To these should be added his lofty spiritual qualities such as boundless loyalty to the ideals of communism and internationalism, a high level of consciousness and responsibility to society and active participation in public life; the communist ethic is firmly rooted in his life and in his labour. The man of socialism, living a rich spiritual life, has a wide range of intellectual pursuits, displays a keen interest in science and art and strives for all-round development and improvement.

We are far from suggesting that all people of socialist society display these features. We still meet with those who have a shyness for socially useful work, and who display social passivity and inertia. Nevertheless, the features enumerated are of the essence of the socialist personality. And the explanation is, first, that socialism provides real possibilities for inculcating these features in every individual and, second, because these features are innate to a large majority of people in socialist society.

The appearance of the socialist man is accompanied by a unity of the individual and society. This unity has a solid objective base in the public ownership which integrates the basic public and personal interests. With the absence of exploitation and with work being obligatory for all, man's striving to improve his status is realised in working for the benefit of all society.

While this increasing unity of man and society is an objective trend, associated with the further development of socialism, it should not be seen as travelling along a straight line. Unity of the individual and society does not exclude the

possibility of contradictions between them, seeing that socialism is not yet able fully to satisfy individual needs and makes the measure of their satisfaction the quantity and quality of work, is still not in a position to provide full economic equality, equal conditions for development, for bringing out the qualities of all without exception. What is more, the individual is not always aware of the need to identify his interest with the public interest and, at times, makes immoderate and selfish demands on society with the result that contradictions may arise between society or at least the bulk of its members with another part of its members. But in time these contradictions, should they arise, are overcome and the unity of the individual and society develops in the direction of a harmonious relationship. In the process of advancing towards this harmony both society and the individual change, and the condition for the development of the individual is the development of society and its reconstruction.

\* \* \*

Socialism, as noted in the Main Document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, offers mankind the prospect of getting rid of imperialism. The new social system, based on public ownership and on working-class rule, can ensure a planned, crisis-free growth of the economy in the interests of the public, guarantee the social and political rights of the working man, create conditions for genuine democracy, for real participation by the people in conducting the affairs of society, for all-round development of the individual, for equal rights for the nations and for their friendship. It has been demonstrated that socialism, and socialism alone, is capable of solving the fundamental problems facing mankind.

COMMUNISM—THE HIGHER PHASE  
OF THE NEW SOCIETY

Scientific communism charted man's way to a future of happiness. How do we envisage communism in its finished form, what prospects does it hold out to mankind?

Our concept of this society of the future should not be regarded as being complete and exhaustive; being based on the experience acquired in the course of building socialism and communism, on the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory, our ideas concerning communism can only be projections of its basic features, as to what it will be like in particulars only time will show. Those who come after us will decide how labour and everyday life will be arranged under communism. However, our scientific concept of it enables the revolutionary forces to see the contours, to discern the goal towards which the efforts of advanced part of humanity are directed.

## 1. The Main Features of the Future Society

In essaying a description of the future society we begin with its material and technological base.

The Material  
and Technological Base  
of Communism

As we have seen, production under socialism is highly developed. Its present-day level, however, is not adequate completely to satisfy the constantly growing needs—material and cultural—of the people. And until it is reached there can be no talk of communism, since distribution according to need is one of its fundamental principles. Communism is the society of

abundance, and to achieve this abundance there is but one way, that of a really massive development of the productive forces culminating in rounding off the material and technological base of the communist society. With this accomplished and abundance assured, and with each member of society working in the full measure of his ability, the era of the communist principle of distribution according to need begins.

Abundance, however, not being the ultimate goal, is seen as a means towards achieving the fundamental aim of historical progress, that is the conditions (economic, social and cultural) for man's all-round development. Not material things and not just riches, but people in all their variety of abilities and requirements are the chief wealth of the new society. With communism, Marx wrote, comes that unfolding of man's powers which is the goal of the genuine kingdom of freedom, and the conditions for that greater dignity of which *humankind* are worthy.

How do we envisage the material and technological base of communism?

The first thing to be said about it is that its construction presupposes something more than a quantitative growth, a multiplication of production capacities. It signifies above all far-reaching changes in the actual production process. Complete electrification, perfecting techniques and technology, organisation of all social production; complex mechanisation of all labour processes and their ever fuller automation; wide application of chemistry; emphasis on expansion of the new and economically effective branches, new kinds of fuels, power and materials; rational utilisation of nature resources and manpower; organically combined science and industry and accelerated technological progress; a high educational and technical level of all workers; a considerable lead in labour productivity over the highly developed capitalist countries—that is how we conceive the material and technological base of communism.

With planning elevated to *topmost* levels, communism will ensure purposeful and rational utilisation of the material wealth, of natural and manpower resources. With its emphasis on *perfect* technology, communism will give man an infinitely greater domination over nature, enabling him on an ever-growing scale to control the elements and bring

them under use. Steady progress, then, providing each member of society with material and cultural values in keeping with his ever-growing needs, interests and tastes—that is the goal of communist production.

This will be a *completely mechanised and automated* production. In the automated enterprises all the technical operations without exception will be performed without the direct participation of the worker. He will simply adjust and supervise the functioning of the automatic instruments and chart the programme and the technical regime. The wholly automated plant is, of course, also a feature of socialism, but in the socialist phase such plants are few in number and are not typical for industry as a whole. With communism, however, automation really comes into its own. "Clever" machines and apparatuses will control entire plants, power stations and grid systems, oilfields, mines, ore workings, planes, ships and trains and, in time, the entire economy.

As with socialism, electrification will be the nerve centre of the material and technological base of communism. For complete electrification is the threshold to automation, electronics, cybernetics, radio engineering and chemicals, that is, application of the technology typical for the completely mechanised and automated industry of communism. Evidently, we shall see the harnessing of other kinds of energy—nuclear, solar energy, the heat contained in the bowels of the earth, and also of the tides, practical assimilation of which is presently in its infancy.

Complete electrification will signify a leap in heavy industry, metallurgy, metal-working, in fuels, in chemicals and other branches. Expansion in these basic sectors will, in time, lead to higher levels in all other branches—consumer goods and durables, agriculture, building, transport, communications and service industries. In a word, all the needs of the country will be fully satisfied.

Science is decisive for the material and technological base of communism. When it is in *full measure a productive force*, it will define the techniques and technology of the society of the future and, likewise, the professional and technical skills of the people.

The industry of communism with its unprecedented speeds, enormous pressures and super-high temperatures is unthinkable

without man-made materials. Right now science, jointly with industry, is engaging nature in a real competition for "quality", with success more and more frequently accruing to science. Here we have in mind plastics, artificial rubbers, man-made fibres and other products of the modernised chemical industry without which not a single branch of the economy can function.

A highly productive and large-scale agriculture is a vital component of the material and technological base of communism. Population growth, higher incomes and growing well-being—all presuppose greater demand for foodstuffs and consumer goods of high quality. Hence the need for accelerated agricultural production and its saturation with all the machines of which the new technology is capable.

These, in outline, are the main features of the material and technological base of communism.

The vastly increased production will be achieved chiefly through *growth of labour productivity*—the measure of economic progress and a major source of abundance. Greater labour productivity will result from the revolution in technology, from the rational utilisation of manpower and from improved technological skills.

"Communism is the higher productivity of labour—compared with that existing under capitalism—of voluntary, class-conscious and united workers employing advanced techniques."<sup>1</sup>

Concerning the material and technological base of communism one should note, first, that our brief survey of it offers but an approximate picture; a really satisfactory description of the scientific and technological discoveries from which it will derive would not be an easy matter. And second, the features mentioned above are more or less typical not only for the advanced phase of socialism but also for highly developed capitalism. From a quick glance at the trade-mark on machines who would venture to say whether they were made in a socialist factory or in a capitalist factory? But having said this it should be recalled that in the society of socialism or communism the machines produced belong to their producers—the working people—and are

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 427.

used by the latter in their own interests, whereas under capitalism the machines belong to the private owner and are designed for his enrichment.

With the material and technological base of communism installed the flow of abundance to all members of society will imply that it will now be possible to go over to the communist distribution according to need.

From Each According  
to His Ability,  
to Each According  
to His Need

*The fundamental principle of communism is "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need". Its realisation is prepared in the course of the gradual advance*

from socialism to communism.

Socialism brings into conscious endeavour millions of people who surprise the world by the magnitude of their achievements in all spheres of life. Socialism, in clearing the way for application of the abilities of the working people, insists that they be deployed for the benefit of society as a whole, and in the measure that the individual abides by this demand, in that measure will his needs be satisfied. Hence the principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work".

This demand is retained also under communism. Here, however, it undergoes change, becoming much richer and more varied.

In the socialist phase it is still not possible to provide equal conditions for all: political equality yes, but not economic and social equality. It hardly needs saying that he who is well off materially has better opportunities for self-improvement, especially in the matter of education and culture. The resident of the city—where the main centres of culture are located—has advantages in this respect over the rural resident. And women who have to devote much time to domestic work and the upbringing of the children are likewise handicapped.

Communism, however, for all the reasons mentioned above, provides for *all* the conditions for *equal* application of abilities and also for a more purposeful application of them both in the sphere of production and beyond it. Under communism labour is still the measure of "From each according to his ability", but this is not obligatory labour, not only a means of life, it is labour in the full measure of

human ability, labour as a habit, as a vital necessity. Under communism man will have the urge to work where he can give of his best and where he can contribute most to society.

Under communism "From each according to his ability" is not only voluntary, unpaid labour for society in full measure of one's ability, it is in addition active participation in public life and in managing the affairs of society. Socialism, too, inspires large masses of people to take part in public life, but there are still many who do not participate in social management. Some will plead lack of time, others that they don't know enough about it, while still others lacking the necessary degree of consciousness adopt the attitude of "I'm alright Jack, to hell with you". But under communism *each* will have a part in the affairs of society. Nor can it be otherwise, for with the onset of communism the state disappears and is replaced by public self-rule with all members of society having their say and doing their bit.

And lastly, "From each according to his ability" under communism becomes also a kind of morality for citizens gradually to acquire the habit of observing the rules of the communist way of life, whereas in the socialist phase we still encounter law-breakers, those who infringe ethical rules and principles and disturb the peace.

It will be seen, therefore, that highly productive labour as the first requirement of life, diligent study, improving skills, a high level of education, participation by each in the affairs of society and voluntary observance of the norms of communist ethics—these are at the heart of "From each according to his ability" and chief of these is work.

The adversaries of communism trying to blacken this principle argue that it is incompatible with man's all-round and harmonious development, with fully satisfying his material and intellectual needs. There is something ascetic, they claim, about socialism, that it results in people being forced to think and act alike and that the main thing is not the individual as such but production, machines and technology. In their view the growing affluence will result in an individualism completely at loggerheads with communist principles. Communists, however, reject the argument that affluence is incompatible with a communist society. They say on the contrary that communist society with its super-abundance of things will provide generously not merely for all the

needs of the citizen in the matter of food, shelter, clothing and other necessities, but will in addition provide him no less generously also with everything needed for his cultural advancement and for his leading a rich and satisfying life. It will herald the ending of economic inequality, of inequality in distribution, will signify further that all citizens have equal opportunity fully to satisfy all their needs. People will no longer think in terms only of income, of calculating in this way or that, no longer display greed and money-grubbing. Money will no longer be necessary and, lastly, the individual will be able to devote himself to loftier things in which the public interest will have pride of place. Communism has nothing whatever in common with asceticism, with any levelling of needs and interests. What is needed, in the communist view, is not equality of needs but *equal opportunity* to satisfy them.

It follows, then, that all members of society, in keeping with tastes, physiological and psychological attributes, will be able fully to satisfy all their needs.

Each will have equal opportunity to study, to satisfy his intellectual needs in full measure. Since ability, interests and aspirations differ widely in people, their intellectual and material needs will not be the same. Moreover, since they will be people of different professions and age groups, people inured to different climates, it follows that their needs just cannot be identical.

Far from being as alike as peas in a pod, communist equality will be the equality of people who, very much in love with life, are vibrant, active and different. Each will have his own individuality deriving from ability, education, general knowledge, tastes and interests, likes and dislikes. All will work with inspiration and live a rich, full-blooded and happy life. This equality will not be reached overnight, but gradually, step by step, as the material and technological base of communism takes shape and with the moulding of communist social relationships and the education of the new man.

People's needs obviously will undergo considerable change, becoming wider and more varied. Perhaps the biggest change will be in intellectual growth. But be the needs what they may, people will not be given to excess or to caprice. Their needs will be those of rational people, healthy in body and

in mind, they will be men and women of all-round development. In all likelihood communism will engender a multitude of new needs and, by the same token, it will find ample means for their satisfaction.

#### Communism and Labour

Communism, being incompatible with a vulgar equality and asceticism, rejects yet another extreme expressed in the view that the new society will be given over to idleness and depravity. Distribution according to need by no means signifies that expenditure of effort will not be needed in order to obtain the things required.

In addition to abundance another precondition for communist equality and distribution according to need is communist labour.

Communist labour, universal, voluntary and free from exploitation, is based on public ownership and on a highly advanced technological base; being scientifically organised, it is highly productive and creative, organically combining physical and mental effort; it is labour to the best of one's ability; labour as the prime requirement of life.

The rule of socialist society: he who does not work, neither shall he eat has long become the law of life for the overwhelming majority of citizens. And for many even now life is unthinkable without work which for them is a source of satisfaction, a pleasure and a requirement of life. But in the socialist phase this is not true for all members of society. In this phase there are still shirkers and those who look on useful work as on an unpleasant duty and prefer to live at the expense of society, and those who fulfil their obligations with great reluctance. But with the arrival of communism this scornful attitude to work will disappear.

In this future society people will work at jobs enabling them to give free rein to their abilities and to bring the greatest benefit to society. Based on the highly automated production and with a high level of consciousness of the people, communism will provide all the conditions needed for the growth of abilities and also the best conditions for their fuller and more purposeful application. All people will work to the best of their ability. Any other attitude is unthinkable in the communist phase. And with work being man's chief ability it will also become for him a prime necessity and everyday habit.

In pursuing these aims it becomes necessary to change the very nature of work, to do away with the laborious physical labour, with the monotonous and exceedingly exhausting jobs, to develop the creative aspect of work, make it aesthetically attractive and transform it into a source of joy and satisfaction. Only when work becomes the fullest expression of man's individuality will it fully harmonise with the innate creative essence of man.

The milestones along the way to this happy state of affairs are the material and technological base of communism, comprehensive mechanisation and still fuller automation of all production processes.

The rapid scientific and technological progress underlying the material and technological base of communism makes greater demands on skills, on specialised training and education. And with the perfecting of techniques and the accompanying growth of skills the dividing lines between workers by hand and brain begin to fade away. The intellectual aspect of labour, its creativity gains in importance. The technological progress results in labour losing its one-sidedness—chiefly in the hand or brain aspects—in a new kind of labour with the manual and mental efforts organically fusing.

Is there under communism the likelihood of automated production leading to a state of affairs in which there will be nothing whatever for people to do? Hardly. We see no grounds for fears on this score. The automata will assuredly accelerate the disappearance of the laborious and exhausting jobs but they will never obviate the need for physical and mental effort, and are hardly likely to reduce work to some kind of posture.

Work has always been and will be for ever a process of the interaction of man and nature, of man wresting from nature the things needed for his existence. And parallel with the growth of science and technology his impact on nature will be extended. In ever larger measure man is likely to betake himself to a probing in what for him will be unusual and onerous conditions, for example, in the bowels of the earth, in the depths of the ocean and in outer space; these conditions will demand from him physical tempering, sound health and the vast ability to overcome unforeseen difficulties and withstand severe nervous strain. Where

work is, difficulties will always be there, as is the active play of mind and muscle.

#### The Oneness of the New Society

The onset of communism will also be accompanied by big changes in the social relationships. In the socialist phase society, as we have seen, remain stratified. Given the division of labour between town and countryside, between mental and manual work, differences exist between the working class, peasantry and intellectuals. *Under communism, however, the division of society into classes and social strata ends;* with agricultural work assuming a kinship with work in industry, and with bringing the socio-economic and cultural conditions of life in the countryside into line with those of urban life, the distinctions between town and country are overcome with the result that the stratification of society into an industrial working class and rural peasantry disappears. Obliterating the distinctions between mental and manual work requires more time, since it presupposes elevating the educational and technological level of the factory worker and the peasant cultivator to that of the technician and engineer. The end result is that the intelligentsia as a specific social stratum disappears. Worker, peasant and intellectual now feature as men of the new society, with each member engaging in mental and manual labour. In this society mental and physical effort organically fuse in production.

As the class borderlines thin out and the social relationships of communism take shape the nations draw closer to each other—mutual co-operation is extended and, with it, exchanges of production experience and cultural achievements.

Eventually, the drawing together process culminates in a merging of the nations. But for this and for the fading away of the distinctions between them much more time will be needed than is the case with the disappearance of the class distinctions. With the advent of communism the class distinctions disappear, but the distinctions between the nationalities, and especially language differences, remain for a fairly long time.

#### People's Self-rule

With the arrival of socialism large masses of the working people are brought into active participation in public life, with literally millions taking part in managing industry and agriculture

and political and cultural life. Mass organisations play a bigger role in economic and cultural development and are actively involved in the political issues of the day and in extending socialist democracy. Each citizen can now say with pride: I am the state. And this is understandable, because under socialism the dictatorship of the proletariat has evolved into the state of the whole people.

But in the socialist phase not every citizen takes part in public life for a variety of reasons. Consequently, it is most important that millions more in the town and in the countryside should gain experience in the school of state administration. The desirable thing is that literally all citizens should actively participate in running the country.

The withering away of the state, it should be said, does not produce any disorganisation in society, since the functions of state administration, like those of guiding the economy and cultural life presently carried out by the state, are retained though in a modified form, also under communism. Their exercise is facilitated, since with the habit of each working to the best of his ability and of observing the rules of the communist way of life, the likelihood of excesses is extremely remote. Communism is, in effect, a well-organised society of people of labour in which everybody knows his place and his functions and discharges them in the most conscientious manner.

At the same time the character of the functions and the methods of fulfilling them will, understandably, differ from what they are in the socialist days. With the class distinctions obliterated in the advance to communism, the administrative bodies gradually shed their political and class character; then, with the disappearance of classes, these bodies, merging with the social organisations, *become bodies of public self-rule*. This means that *all members of society* now take part in guiding economic and social life. It should be added that this will be administration not of people but of things, guidance of the social processes, effected now not by state or political bodies but by the social organisations.

There is no longer any need whatever for compulsion and, consequently, no need for a special apparatus of coercion, for legal rules protected by judicial and punitive bodies.

And so with the disappearance of classes *the state, too, disappears, or dies out*. The time has come for the state, as

Engels expressed it, to be consigned to its rightful place, to the Museum of Antiquities alongside the spinning wheel and the bronze axe.

## 2. The Individual Under Communism

*Communism presupposes also a new type of man, a man who combines in himself spiritual richness, moral purity and physical perfection.* Communist man will be an all-round, harmoniously developed personality, able to unfold in full measure his ability and talent. Socialism is still not able to provide everybody with equal conditions for development, education and application of ability. Take, for example, the status of woman. The woman's lot, as everybody knows, is not an easy one. For in addition to working for wages or salary she bears the main burden of domestic work and bringing up the family.

Consequently, for large numbers of women the opportunity to study, to improve professional qualifications and to enjoy leisure is severely restricted. Under communism, however, the main burden of everyday life will be shared by society, and the woman, emancipated from the numerous time-consuming and often exhausting chores, will be free to put her abilities and talents to full use.

With its highly automated production and the high level of consciousness of each citizen, communist society provides, in addition to equal conditions for self-development, the conditions needed for a fuller and more purposeful application of abilities. The worker will have the free time needed to add to his general knowledge and to improve his professional skill, all facilities for leisure and recreation, for taking part in artistic and literary life, for helping in the home with the children and their upbringing and will have time for physical training and sport.

While performing his stint in production, the worker in the communist society will be an all-round personality, supervisor of the complex production processes and a direct creator of spiritual values.

Obviously, a certain division of labour will be needed also under communism. It would be wrong to imagine the worker in this society as a kind of universal Jack of all

trades, capable of performing any and every kind of job. Communist production presupposes a high level of organisation, accuracy and discipline. But what does disappear is the narrow, one-sided specialisation which in the past confined people to a particular job for the whole of their working lives. Now they will have the skills and the opportunities enabling them to change jobs and to vary their work. And with the greatly enlarged free time, changes in the mode of life take place also outside the sphere of production. The doors to sport, to art and to science will be opened to all.

True, under socialism hangovers of the past such as malingering, pilfering, scrounging, drunkenness and hooliganism still persist. But with the advance to communism these will be overcome through public influence, with the lofty principles of the communist ethic becoming the general custom and the sole regulator of human behaviour and attitudes. *A high level of public consciousness, diligence and discipline, utter loyalty to the interests of society—these will be the hallmark of communist man.* The exceptionally high level of organisation and accuracy demanded from him by the automated production derives not from compulsion, but from a profound understanding of public duty.

**Communism—the  
Summit  
of Human Freedom**

Ushering in a boundless extension of freedom, communism signifies above all the emancipation of man as a worker, as a producer of wealth. Socialism had the distinction of abolishing private ownership and of liberating labour from exploitation. But there still remained the laborious manual work and the narrow specialisation which hampered the free and full growth of the worker. With communism comes the era when work becomes a prime necessity of life, a noble habit. Work, highly automated or mechanised, based on the newest discoveries of science, now becomes genuinely creative, attractive and easy. In this free labour of communism man asserts himself as a free and fully developed personality.

He is assured complete *economic* emancipation and freedom not only as the producer of material and spiritual values but also as their consumer. Whereas in the socialist phase, notwithstanding all that had been done in the way of well-being, needs could not be fully met, now, under commun-

ism, man is relieved of all material difficulties and all his needs are wholly and completely satisfied, with all that this means in the matter of freedom.

Communism signifies that the *topmost levels of social freedom have been reached*, freedom for man as *citizen* and *public personality*. The withering away of the state is accompanied by the disappearing of the last elements of legal compulsion and of state control over the individual. Communism is that society in which public self-rule replaces the state, which implies the active and free participation of each in the management of all aspects of community life.

For the first time in human history man now acquires genuine *intellectual freedom*, final emancipation from every illusion and prejudice, including religion, while his acquisition of vast knowledge elevates to the highest his dignity as a conscious human being, as subduer of the powerful forces of nature and now their master, master of his destiny, the destiny of free mankind. He acquires the greatest *ethical freedom*. By casting off the last remnants of the morals of the old capitalist society, man by force of habit will abide by the lofty rules of the community, and freely, through inner conviction, will align his thoughts, feelings and actions with those of his fellow citizens.

Communism, then, is *the very summit of human freedom*. It affirms the genuinely free, harmonious growth of the individual, satisfies his manifold needs both as producer and consumer, as a public personality and as a thinking and sensitive being, it provides for the fullest application and improvement of man's ability.

As we see, communism signifies the greatest change in the long history of man, the most thorough-going change in literally every sphere of human activity—in production, in the nature of work and its conditions, in social relationships, culture and the way of life, and also in ideas and views. It assures for each those conditions which in full measure correspond to man's cherished aspirations, to his loftiest ideals.

"Communism," we read in the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will

be accompanied by the growth of productive forces through continuous progress of science and technology; all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need' will be implemented. Communism is a highly organised society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognised by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people."<sup>1</sup>

Communism, then, fulfils its grand historic mission: it liberates people from social inequality, from oppression of every kind, from the horrors of war, and it inaugurates on earth the reign of Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and the Happiness of all nations.

#### Communism—the Successor to Socialism

Having examined socialism and communism as the two phases of the new society, we can now affirm that, as distinct from socialism which derived directly from capitalism and for this reason bore its birthmarks, communism is *built on the foundation of a consolidated and developing socialism*. This explains the fundamental difference in the ways and means of arriving at one and the other. Socialism follows from the socialist revolution, from the abolition of the economic, political and cultural pillars of capitalism. No revolution is needed for communism, since it, as we have seen, grows directly from socialism in the course of the development of its economy, social relationships and culture.

The material and technological base of communism derives from socialist production, from its planned growth and consolidation. One communist ownership is the outcome of the growth and gradual fusing of the two forms of socialist ownership—state and co-operative—while communist self-rule derives from the socialist state of the whole people.

With the considerable differences in kind between socialism and communism, it follows that in the process of the latter coming into being particular features of socialism become obsolete and make way for the new features of communism. However, the replacement of the one by the other takes

place solely by way of reinforcing the principles of socialism and by utilising these principles in full measure, by taking advantage of all the possibilities contained in them. For example, the communist principle of distribution according to need can be applied solely through all-round development and application of the socialist principle of distribution according to work done, and only when it has exhausted all its possibilities does this principle become superfluous and, ultimately, impossible.

Already in socialist society we observe a steady development of the communist forms of labour and organisation of production, of the social forms of satisfying the people's material and cultural needs. And with the continued advance towards communism these new features grow and spread, elbowing out everything standing in the way of the onward march of society.

Communism, then, is the answer to the fundamental needs of the people; of all social systems it is the most genuinely humane. It is this that explains why communism is winning the hearts and the minds of growing millions of people, why it is gaining supporters in ever-growing numbers on all continents.

In this lies the strength of communism, the vital factor of its triumph throughout the world.

<sup>1</sup> *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, p. 509.

## BUILDING COMMUNISM IN THE USSR

In the USSR socialism has come into its own wholly and irrevocably. There is no force in the world capable of restoring the capitalist system in the country. And with socialism completed *the Soviet people have taken to building communism.*

Three main undertakings must be tackled and completed before communism is reached. These are: laying its material and technological base, shaping the social relationships of communism and, lastly, moulding the new man—the man of communist society endowed with a high level of consciousness. These three closely linked undertakings are the different aspects of the evolution of socialist society into communism.

### 1. The Material and Technological Base of Communism

#### Intensive Method of Growth

During the building of socialism production took place chiefly by *extensive* methods, that is by enlarging capacity and using more manpower.

With the advent of communism the extensive method is superseded by the *intensive* method of growth, accompanied by the application of all the new achievements in science and technology and by the improvement of the system of economic management.

Intensive production, then, signifies all-round application of the latest machines, mechanisms and equipment, new types of materials, fuel, highly productive processes (physico-chem-

ical, electrical, electronic, and others) and large-scale modernisation of industrial plant. In 1966-70, for example, Soviet industry turned out over 20,000 new types of machines and equipment. In 1970 alone, nearly 3,000 models of new machines, equipment and apparatuses and about 1,000 new types of instruments were designed and made, and some 1,500 items with better technical and economic characteristics were put into mass production.

We are presently restructuring industry chiefly by way of developing those branches which determine the main trends in the scientific and technological advance—electric power, machine-building, chemicals, instrument-making, metallurgy, especially high quality metals; improving intra-sectoral proportions and increasing the share of the more profitable types of production that satisfy consumer demand with the least expenditure.

Also envisaged are greater economic specialisation and co-operation, all-round unification and standardisation of units and details and the development of the economically useful forms of combined production. Specialisation makes it possible to pursue a uniform technological policy in every sector, to apply the latest achievements of science and technology, to put to the best use the material, labour and financial resources, to organise an efficient exchange of scientific information, to develop research and designing, to train highly skilled personnel, and to standardise production. In a word, specialisation provides for higher labour productivity, for improved quality of output, for better services to the population and for extensive development of education, science and culture.

Further intensive production provides for a better use of equipment, raw materials and fuel, for a broader replacement of non-ferrous metals by cheaper materials, including synthetic materials, as well as for the lower cost-price of goods, for greater productivity, reliability and durability of machinery and equipment, for the extension of assortment and improvement of consumer goods.

On the agenda, too, are wide-ranging research and application of its results and speedier utilisation of inventions and rationalisation proposals. The idea here is for science to be ahead of production and technology, for the more science helps practice, feeds industry with new ideas, design-

ing and technological decisions, the faster will technology advance and social production grow.

Accelerated growth of labour productivity will be secured by supplying labour with more electric power, through comprehensive mechanisation and automation and by way of scientific organisation of labour.

Needed, too, is a more rational allocation of the forces of production with a view to more comprehensive utilisation of natural resources, labour and finance; long-distance and non-rational transportation of goods is to be cut to the minimum, with maximum effort being expended on siting industry in neighbourhoods with the necessary materials, labour and consumers.

The network for training specialists—engineers, technicians, office employees and industrial personnel—is being overhauled in line with the new needs of science and technology.

The all-round intensification of social production, a rise in its efficiency, say the Directives of the 24th CPSU Congress for the Five-Year Economic Development Plan of the USSR for 1971-75, "is the main line of the country's economic development both in the next few years and for a long term, a major requisite for building the material and technical basis of communism". The Directives listed the main factors of intensive production: the acceleration of the pace of scientific and technical progress, consistent raising of the working people's level of education and skills, the improvement of management, planning and the provision of economic incentives in production.

As we see, intensive production presupposes a radical change in the nature and structure of industry, both in its material and in its human components. Production, enlarged and more concentrated, becomes assembly-line mass production, while the new types of goods produced become the embodiment of the latest scientific and technological achievements, giving greater satisfaction to consumers. Production is more rhythmic, and with its processes accelerated and the cycle shortened, the volume of unfinished work declines, while input-output ratio, labour costs and expenditure on fuel and materials are cut; transport of details, units and aggregates within the confines of the enterprise, inspection for quality, and accounting and sales are improved.

Intensive production is decisive also for agriculture for which a whole system of measures is envisaged. These include amelioration, greater application of chemicals, comprehensive mechanisation, scientific methods, including labour organisation, specialisation, moral and material stimulation, and cost accounting—all designed to secure greater output, growth of labour productivity and reduced production costs.

Time-saving and better results with the least expenditure—such are the underlying purposes of intensive agriculture. Another aim is to increase the percentage of protein in wheat, of sugar in beet and oil in sunflower. Application of science and extended theoretical and experimental research in economics, biology, agronomic techniques, zootechnics and mechanisation—these are of the utmost significance for intensive farming. Scientists enhance their responsibility for the scholarly value of their recommendations and for the efficient introduction of scientific achievements in agricultural production.

People—the main productive force—also change; division of labour becomes more widespread, new jobs and occupations make their appearance, old ways die out and the new come to the fore. The ranks of skilled operatives grow, more attention is paid to acquiring skills and know-how, to raising educational and technical levels. Big changes take place also in the work force, in its professional make up and in everyday relationships.

The Five-Year Plan—1971-75—the guidelines for which were agreed by the 24th Congress of the CPSU has a special significance for the material and technological base of communism. The fulfilment of this plan will secure the substantial advance of Soviet society along the lines of communist construction and contribute to the further strengthening of the economic might and defence of the country, its further cultural progress. *"The main task of the Five-Year Plan is to secure a considerable rise in the living standard and cultural level of the people on the basis of high rates of growth of socialist production, increase in its effectiveness, scientific and technical progress and accelerated growth of the productivity of labour."*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress, Moscow, 1971, p. 49.

In the coming five years the national income is to be increased 37-40 per cent, industrial output will rise 42-46 per cent and annual average agricultural output 20-22 per cent.

During the past five years industry—the main branch of the economy and the base of its power and defence capacity—has advanced considerably. Volume of output is up by 50 per cent. In 1970, the country produced 116 million tons of steel, 353 million tons of oil and 740,000 million kwh of electric power.

The rising output is accompanied by steady improvement in its structure, with those branches closely associated with the technological advance—machine-building, electric power, metallurgy and chemicals—showing the fastest growth.

In the Eighth Five-Year Plan period (1966-70) annual average farm output increased by 21 per cent as against 12 per cent in the preceding five-year period. In 1970, grain harvests averaged 1.56 tons per hectare as compared with 0.95 ton in 1965. That same year the country gathered over 186 million tons of grain. Animal husbandry, sugar beet, cotton, vegetables and other crops likewise recorded bigger yields. This success, coupled with the steady rise in incomes, was accompanied by a significant growth in the demand for basic food products.

And now for a closer look at the technological revolution which, as we have noted, plays the key role in intensive production and acts as a powerful factor of social progress.

#### The Scientific and Technological Revolution and Its Social Effects

Our generation is the witness of an *unfolding revolution in science and technology* and of remarkable progress in automation, radio-electronics and telecommunications, in harnessing the atom, exploring outer space, in cybernetics, chemistry, physics, biology and in other areas. The significance of this revolution is such that not a single happening in our times can be appreciated without fundamental analysis of this revolution and especially of its social consequences.

In our day science and technology are the battlefield on which the struggle and competition between the rival social systems of capitalism and socialism are being fought out.

In his day Lenin noted that "those who have the greatest technical equipment, organisation and discipline and the

best machines, will gain the upper hand".<sup>1</sup> And, stressing the point, he added, "without science, technology and all-round knowledge the building of socialism is unthinkable".

In keeping with this counsel, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union devotes the utmost attention to developing science and technology. The 24th CPSU Congress resolution said: "Speeding up scientific and technical progress is the decisive condition for raising the effectiveness of social production. Fundamental scientific research should be extended, fuller use should be made of the achievements of science and technology, all branches of the national economy should be steadily re-equipped according to plan on the basis of up-to-date, highly productive machinery, the schedule of developing and introducing new machinery and progressive production techniques should be reduced to the minimum, and advanced home and foreign experience should be applied more actively."

The revolution in science and technology is common to both the capitalist and socialist systems. But since the laws of development and the purpose of production in the two systems differ fundamentally, the same holds true for the motives underlying the advances in science and technology and for their socio-economic consequences and prospects.

In capitalist society the motive of motives is profit, which presupposes ruthless competitive struggle. It is precisely this drive for maximum profit and to defeat one's rival on the market that compels the capitalist to turn to science and use it for the purpose of perfecting production techniques. The capitalists in the highly developed countries (the United States, Britain, Federal Germany, Japan, and others) are making wide use of the technological advance to increase output, secure greater productivity per worker and improve quality. And it would be a grave error to close one's eyes to the scientific and technological progress in these countries or to ignore their experience, since the latter can be usefully applied in the socialist countries, bearing in mind, of course, the specific features of the socialist economy.

This does not mean, however, closing one's eyes to the far-reaching contradictions engendered by the technological break-through under capitalism where it is used to step up

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 195.

the exploitation. In fact this explains why in capitalist society the advances are frequently hamstrung by one-sided application. The big monopolies are concerned chiefly with those branches of science which hold out the promise of still bigger profits. It is not difficult to discern, for example, the special attention which they devote to the particular branches serving the war industry. For them war is a highly profitable business. And the militarisation lends an exceedingly dangerous aspect to science and technology in the capitalism of today. By virtue of scientific and technological progress, capitalist production displays expansionist proclivities, whereas the purchasing power of the people is restricted and market supply is affected by the competitive struggle. New labour-saving devices make large numbers of workers redundant and this, too, reducing purchasing power, acts as a brake on scientific and technological progress.

The anarchy in production and the competition on the market engender secrecy with regard to inventions and patents, hindering thereby co-operation in scientific and technological matters and, quite frequently, giving rise to unnecessary duplication. Valuable inventions and discoveries are often locked away by the monopolies in anticipation of the day when their "market value" might be infinitely greater.

This is the opposite of the way things are done under socialism. For socialism, as we have said, sees in planned production the best way to ensure well-being and all-round development of all members of society. For this reason socialism and communism give the green light to the revolution in science and technology, using it not to the detriment of the people, as is often the case under capitalism, but to their advantage.

Under socialism, science is regarded as a boon to production, as a means of adding to the prosperity of the working people and their cultural standards. It is a vital factor in the building of communism. The natural sciences play the decisive role in developing and improving technology, in adding to the industrial know-how of the worker and in enlarging his educational and technological vision. The social sciences, too, occupy a special place; they provide people with knowledge of the workings of society and of its development; provide guidelines for the economic and social

processes; play a big role in communist education and in helping people to assimilate the dialectical-materialist philosophy. It can be said without the slightest hesitation that under socialism science is a powerful instrument for peace, for constructive endeavour and for all-round progress.

One of the really distinguishing features of science under socialism is that it is genuinely the science of the people and for the people. And not just in the sense that it serves the people, but chiefly in that all its doors are wide open to them. Soviet scientists, numbered in their tens of thousands, are the sons and daughters of the people to whom they dedicate all their strength and knowledge. Their ranks are joined by the literally millions of innovators in industry and agriculture, by the inventors and those among the factory workers and collective farmers who make all kinds of rationalisation suggestions.

Socialism makes it possible to conduct research according to a state-wide plan and to co-ordinate the efforts of the numerous research institutes. One advantage of this is that the researchers are able to concentrate on the really pressing problems. Their world outlook—dialectical and historical materialism—the predominant philosophy under socialism, rids science of the barren influence of idealism and religion and provides researchers with a sure guide in their investigations of the processes taking place in nature and society.

As the building of communist society advances science fuses more and more with the production processes and these in turn make full use of its achievements, *so much so that science is increasingly becoming a direct force of production.*

#### Science Becomes a Direct Force of Production

The growth of science into a productive force in no way signifies that it acts as a new independent element jointly with the means of production and with the working people. Its role as a productive force is acquired not by any particular effort of its own but by virtue of its *technological and human* embodiment.

In what way, then, does science manifest itself as a productive force?

Firstly, the achievements of science *are embodied in the new techniques and technology.* In our time, entire branches of industry such as nuclear energy, polymers, microbiological production, radio-electronics and others, being outgrowths

of science, are unthinkable without it. On an ever-growing scale production is the technological application of science, a reservoir of materialised knowledge, a kind of vast laboratory in which all the new developments are worked over, tested and applied.

Secondly, the achievements of science *are embodied in man as a producer, in his knowledge, skill and professional experience*. Comprehensive mechanisation and even more so automated production call for a greater mental application which presupposes an educated worker with a high level of professional and technical skill. Science enables the worker to improve his qualifications, makes his labour more productive and paves the way to his participation in invention and rationalisation.

Thirdly, *on an ever-growing scale scientific work becomes part of material production, becomes productive work*. Much scientific work is now carried out directly at the point of production, with research and design institutes, bureaux and laboratories located on factory premises and on the co-operative and state farms. In a word, science now takes its place as one of the basic departments in industry.

This concerns chiefly the natural and technical sciences—mechanics, physics, chemistry, biology, etc. At the same time the social sciences, too, and especially economics, invade the realm of production. Using mathematical methods and computers these branches act as a boon to management and show the way to better utilisation of materials, labour and financial resources, which, in view of the vast scale of modern industry, is of the utmost importance. And the role played by the social sciences in moulding the character and the world outlook of the producers speaks for itself.

Looking ahead to the future, science, grappling with theoretical problems, acts as a pioneer of progress, as pathfinder of the new in knowledge and technology.

Science, now that it is a vital sphere of social life, is developing at a tempestuous rate. The numbers of researchers and research establishments are increasing all the time. In the USSR, for example, researchers numbered 927,400 in 1970 compared with 11,600 in 1913. Research allocations are increased at a greater pace than national income and output of industry.

The possibilities for Soviet science are far from being

exhausted. Which explains why the Communist Party and the Soviet Government devote the utmost attention to perfecting the system of planning and management, to stimulating research and to enhancing the economic and social effect of science. A decision on the subject adopted by the Party Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in October 1968 called for still closer links between science and industry. In line with this decision, comprehensive scientific establishments combining research, designing and production, all the way to serial output of the finished product, come into being. Research institutions are now functioning in larger enterprises. More and better planning is seen as the precursor to more effective research and to speedier application of its results.

The 24th Congress set the Communist Party and the Soviet people the historic task: *"organically to fuse the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system, to unfold more broadly our own, intrinsically socialist, forms of fusing science with production"*.<sup>1</sup>

**Economic Reform** Economic reform (adopted by the Central Committee of the CPSU in September 1965 and agreed by the Party's 23rd Congress) is yet another measure designed to facilitate intensive production. The purpose is to reinforce the role of economic methods of management, improve the system of state planning and extend the economic independence and initiative of the enterprises and to see that they practise strict cost accounting. We will now dwell briefly on these points.

The first thing to notice about the reform is that it substantially changes the system of planning, previously practised in the enterprises. Whereas in the past plans were handed down to the enterprise from the centre with numerous (even dozens) indicators, which meant that all the details of its operation were worked out at the top, the reform has cut to the minimum the indicators emanating from the centre, restricting them to output volume, basic nomenclature, profitability, the total wage bill, budget contributions and allocations, the volume of centralised investments, the commis-

<sup>1</sup> *Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress, Moscow, 1971, p. 68.*

sioning of new capacities and fixed assets, the main guidelines for technological development, and indicators for inputs of materials and technical equipment.

The previous method of assessing the operation of the enterprise from the standpoint of output now yields place to assessment based on sales of the finished product. Only those goods accepted and paid for by the purchaser feature in plan fulfilment, and the sum realised by sale of the product provides the source for the wages and bonuses paid to the employees. This heightens the interest of the entire personnel in producing more and better quality goods, in timely fulfilment of orders and in extending the range of output. This calls for close attention to demand and customer choice, for initiative and foresight on the part of the workers, technicians and management in their questing for new varieties of high quality goods.

The reform reinforces cost accounting—one of the basic principles of socialist management—and it upgrades the role of profit. Cost accounting is based on comparing in terms of money the performance of the enterprise with its outlay which is compensated from its income. Strict accounting ensures profitable working, that is excess of income over outlay. Provision is made for incentives and strict responsibility of all, from top to bottom, for economical operation of labour, plant, raw materials and finance.

Profitability is one of the chief indicators for the working of any enterprise. Its success, or its failure, is measured by the magnitude of profit. And the reform, in addition to securing profitable operation, defines the ultimate destination of the profit. The funds ploughed back for purposes of independently installing new plant and equipment derive from profit, which is also the source of the funds agreed by management and workers' representatives for incentive payments; and profit is the source also of the various welfare allocations and the allocations for housing, supplementary to those provided by the state.

The reform, then, greatly extends the economic independence of the enterprise, but this does not signify that it remains outside the sphere of state guidance. On the contrary, exerting economic influence on the enterprise by way of cost accounting, profit, prices, wages, credits and also in other areas associated with value relationships, the state is in a

position to provide guidelines likely to be much more effective than any purely administrative action. Economic methods that supplement administrative methods are based on the exact calculation of real potentialities and reserves, and workers' material interests.

With an important place allocated in the reform to the law of value and the associated commodity-money relations and with the use of such categories as commodity, profit, prices, credit, etc., the opponents of socialism profess to see in this a degradation of the socialist economy and a gradual return to the positions of capitalism. The reform, however, is consistently socialist, for it is being carried out in conditions of socialist public ownership with the main regulating role played by the law of planned, proportional development and the complete absence of exploitation.

As regards the law of value and commodity-money relations and their associated categories (cost accounting, profit and others) while in form they remind us also of the corresponding categories of capitalism, in socialist society they acquire a qualitatively new content. Whereas under capitalism they function as instruments of exploitation, a means of extracting maximum profit, under socialism their significance is that they facilitate growth of production and, consequently, raise the well-being of the people.

Let us dwell for a moment on profit.

Under socialism, as in capitalism, profit is the difference between the expenditure on manufacturing a particular commodity and the income derived from its sale. Profit, the motive force and the purpose of production under capitalism, is the universal form of exploitation, of the appropriation of surplus product. Under socialism profit, although in form the same kind of surplus product, accrues solely to the working people and to no other. Part of this profit goes to meet the needs of society as a whole, the other part is retained for the needs of particular enterprises, for their working collectives. This explains the important role played by profit because it is not only an indicator of effectiveness, it is also a stimulus to the development of the enterprise, to improving its performance.

In addition to its economic aspect the reform also has a social and political context. As we have said, its purpose is to improve performance, and, with industry being the back-

bone of the national economy, the reform, from the standpoint of society as a whole, cannot but have quite considerable socio-political effects.

Industrial growth makes it possible to ensure growth of the rural economy to a degree still greater than that obtaining at present, to supply it with machines, chemicals and other means of stepping up agricultural productivity. Technological progress in industry and following from this also in agriculture helps to raise the cultural and technical levels of both the industrial working class and the rural peasantry. Increased labour productivity in industry results in increased well-being generally and facilitates further progress in education and science.

Expansion of the socialist industry is of very great international significance, since it permits a much higher level in socialism's economic competition with capitalism and this in turn greatly influences the world revolutionary process. The defence capacity of the country is reinforced, the prestige of the Soviet Union and of socialism in general rises and the influence exerted on world development is greater.

Almost all the Soviet industry, a sizable number of building organisations and communal service establishments run on the basis of the economic reform. The Ninth Five-Year Plan period will see the entire Soviet economy running along the lines of the new system of management and economic incentives.

## 2. From Socialist to Communist Relationships

### Towards Economic Equality

*Complete social equality, including economic equality, that is equal opportunity for all to satisfy their material and cultural needs, is one of the principal goals of communism. This equality will be reached only when society has achieved abundance, when labour has become a prime necessity of life and with the transition to the communist principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need".*

The prevailing principle in the advance to communism is, as we have seen, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work". This signifies that the measure of

satisfying the requirements of each member of society relates to his work contribution, to its quality and quantity. In the socialist phase any levelling of material benefits is ruled out. It would, in fact, be regarded as a grave injustice, since it would imply everyone getting the same irrespective of whether he worked well or worked badly. The result would be that the industrious and diligent worker (and in the Soviet Union such workers are legion) could not be expected to display the same interest in working still better, in improving his skill and perfecting technology. Such an attitude, dooming society to stagnation, would greatly retard the advance to communism.

Economic equality is reached not by way of equal distribution, but by perfecting the principle of distribution according to work, by stimulating the personal interest of the worker in the results of his labour. Technological progress and the growth of culture and science are accompanied by a rise in general educational levels and in professional training, with growth of skills and, consequently, higher paid labour; the role of unskilled labour declines. It is along this way that equality of real incomes and the gradual ascent to economic equality are reached.

In the USSR higher real income derives from the higher wages paid to the factory and office workers, from the higher incomes in both cash and kind of collective farmers, from the lower prices in the state-owned and co-operative trading networks and from the increased consumption by way of state welfare benefits.

In this respect much has been done in recent years.

In 1965, for example, 20 million workers employed in the services (retail trade, public catering, education and public health) had their wages increased on the average by 20 per cent and upwards.

In January of that year state pensions were extended to take in the collective farmers and in July 1966 the guaranteed monthly payment for the labour of collective farmers was brought into line with the wages paid to those employed on the state-owned farms for the corresponding kinds of work.

Over 50 million people benefited from measures taken in 1967 to raise the standard of living of various categories of workers.

In 1968, wages were raised for many categories in the building industry and in enterprises producing building materials. In all, 9 million workers and other employees benefited from the increase.

Special attention is paid to the lower paid workers. In 1968, the minimum wage was fixed at 60 rubles, and for some categories it was raised to 70. Resulting from the increased production, real income per head of the population rose in 1966-70 by 33 per cent as against 19 per cent in the previous five years. Average monthly wages of factory and office workers went up 26 per cent, which was in excess of the 20 per cent figure envisaged for the whole of the five-year plan.

In growing measure wages are supplemented by the benefits paid from what in the USSR are termed public consumption funds. From these funds—a socialist way of satisfying the needs of the working people—are paid the expenditure on pre-school care in nursery classes and kindergartens, on boarding schools, the health service, sanatoria, holiday homes, cultural-recreational services, pensions, student grants, and housing and utility allocations. The overall sum of 4,600 million rubles paid out from these funds in 1940 had risen by 1970 to 64,000 million.

The public funds system which corresponds to the collectivist nature of socialism makes possible a rational organisation of child welfare, education, the health service and social security and contributes to liberating women from household drudgery, and to cultivating in people lofty ethical qualities.

Demand for food products and durables and the range of goods in the shops are growing and quality improving. In 1966-70, consumer-goods output rose by 49 per cent. Output of fabrics increased during a period of five years by 1,400 million square metres, leather footwear by 190 million pairs, radio and television sets by 5.7 million and refrigerators by 2,400,000. Output of foods, especially meat products, eggs, cheese and other items greatly increased.

The targets for the massive housing programme outlined at the 23rd Congress of the Party were fulfilled. The years 1966-70 saw the occupation of 518 million square metres, providing accommodation for 55 million citizens.

The Directives of the 24th CPSU Congress for the Five-Year Economic Development Plan of the USSR for 1971-75 contain a broad programme of improving the people's welfare. It is planned to increase real wages by 30 per cent, three-quarters of the accretion in the real incomes of the population being accounted for by higher payment for labour. The minimum monthly wages for workers and office employees will be raised to 70 rubles. The basic wages and salaries of the middle brackets in industry, transport and in other fields of material production will be also raised. The rates for operators of farm machinery are to be increased. Higher salaries are also envisaged for school teachers, doctors and other medical personnel and people in some other professions. In many sectors, additions to wages are to be introduced or increased in the Urals, the European North, Western Siberia, Kazakhstan (excepting the southern part of the Republic) and a number of districts in the Far East, Eastern Siberia and Central Asia. The allowances for night work are to go up considerably.

These measures will be carried out gradually by areas and economic sectors. All in all, they will affect some 90 million workers and office employees. Apart from the increase in payment for labour done, the public consumption funds, too, are to be raised considerably. It is planned to increase these funds by 40 per cent, so that in 1975 they will amount to 90,000 million rubles. These sums will be expended to improve further the medical services, develop education, upbring the rising generation, to improve the living conditions of large and needy families, women working in production, pensioners, and students.

In the next five years it is planned to build housing totalling 565-575 million sq m, which will improve the living conditions of approximately 60 million people. The production and sales of foodstuffs and consumer goods will be expanded considerably and everyday services improved.

*The perfecting of the socialist principle of distribution according to performance, jointly with the steady growth of the public funds, the gradual levelling-up of incomes, all are indicative of the gradual advance from the principle of socialist distribution to that of communism, towards economic equality and, arising therefrom, equal economic status for all. This level will be achieved the more quickly the*

forces of production are expanded and the more labour productivity increases.

At first glance it might seem that growth of well-being is a purely economic undertaking. But that is not the case, if only for the reason that its consummation will have the greatest consequence for society. Prosperity for each citizen and economic equality signify equal opportunity and conditions for all-round growth of abilities and for their best application in the interests of both society and the individual. The man whose material security is assured has ample opportunity for personal improvement especially in the spheres of education and culture. With more free time at his disposal he can take a more vigorous part in public life and busy himself with science, technology, literature and art.

Distribution according to need and its accompanying high level of prosperity will, in the words of Engels, allow "all members of society to develop, maintain and exercise their capacities with maximum universality".<sup>1</sup> Gradually, man, relieved of his daily grind of time-consuming and often exhausting work, from thinking solely in terms of how much he will find in his pay packet, of personal gain, will be able to devote himself wholly to the public interests.

Moreover, a prosperous population will add enormously to the prestige of socialism, attracting to its side ever larger masses of working people in the non-socialist world.

#### Obliterating Essential Distinctions Between Town and Countryside

Socialism, as we have said, does away with the antithesis between town and countryside. But some quite *substantial distinctions* remain; these, however, are overcome in the course of the advance to communism.

What are these distinctions?

The city or the town differs from the countryside in that in the former industry is linked with state ownership, whereas in the rural areas alongside state-owned property (state farms, and some other enterprises) we find co-operative and collective-farm property. Another distinction is that the town is ahead of the rural areas for level of productive forces, technical equipment, quality of labour and division of labour, for level of material well-being and culture, in terms of

living standards and education, transport facilities and communications. Accordingly, abolition of the distinctions between town and countryside presupposes an approximation to and gradual fusing of the co-operative and collective-farm and state-owned property into *property of all the people*; the changes currently taking place in agricultural work show that it is fast becoming a kind of industrial work; in a word, the entire way of life in the countryside is being changed.

Let us look at the matter of ownership. It will be useful to do this because in the process of the growing together and, later, even a fusion of the two forms of ownership, we see the economic base for overcoming the distinction between the industrial worker and the peasant cultivator, that is for *abolishing all class distinctions*, which is what communism is about.

The drawing together and, subsequently, the fusion of state and co-operative and collective-farm property into property of all the people are foreshadowed in the socialist nature of their ownership. Since state property, judging from the standpoint of socialisation and from state planning, is a higher form than the co-operative and collective-farm ownership, the job is gradually to elevate the degree of socialisation of the co-operative and collective-farm ownership to the level of state ownership. With this accomplished the way will be cleared for the merging of the two forms of property into a single property of all the people.

The convergence incidentally is already taking place as can be seen in the steady growth of the *non-distributable assets of the collective farms*. For example, if in 1958 these were valued at 24,200,000 rubles, by 1969 the figure had grown to 55,500,000. The assets, in the shape of machines and equipment, farm buildings, draught animals, dairy and other livestock are the basic means of production of the collective farms. In substance they have a kinship with state property and all the more so because the basic elements—tractors and other machines—are the result not only of the labour of the collective farmers but also of the workers in industry. The assets increase with the growth of the money incomes of the collective farms and in part they are the result of the increased help extended to them by the state.

There is much *inter-co-operation* between the collective farms, evident in joint building and the use of local power

<sup>1</sup> F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 239.

stations, irrigation canals, roads, enterprises for processing, storing and transporting products, brick-making, etc. Contacts of this kind are indicative also of the growth of the co-operative and collective-farm property, of its growing socialisation and, therefore, of its converging into property of all the people.

Convergence is observed also in the steady growth of the contacts between the *collective farms and the state*. The forms here are exceedingly varied: co-operation in building enterprises, in road-making, irrigation, afforestation and so on. The inter-farm contacts and also those between farms and the state are an objective process motivated by the needs of agriculture, by the undertaking of tasks which in scale and complexity would be too much for the single collective farm.

Also taking place are long-term developments such as the rise of *agricultural-industrial complexes* which combine crop raising and processing of products.

The advance towards communism is accompanied by a steady growth of state property in the shape of basic production facilities, in greater concentration of production, its specialisation and in a growing division of labour.

The merging of the two forms of property should not be conceived as a smooth and swift process achieved overnight through administrative action, by decreeing that collective farms be turned into state farms, that by the wave of a wand the collective farmer is suddenly transformed into an industrial worker. The essential elements here are a better and larger material and technological base for the collective farms, greater productivity of labour and its better organisation, wide use of scientific methods and, of course, time and money.

For a long time to come the countryman by virtue of his psychology, limitations, accustomed to group ownership and attachment to his personal plot will still retain the outlook of the collective farmer. Remaking the peasant psychology and changing his way of life will, as we have said, necessitate much time, effort and education.

In overcoming the distinctions between town and countryside and between the industrial worker and the peasant of considerable help is the *changing nature of the farm work*, in other words, the changing role of the peasant in the social organisation of labour. The main thing here is the expansion

of the productive forces brought about by the application of science and technology and by the increased productivity of labour.

Complete electrification, wide use of chemicals, comprehensive mechanisation and automation will play their part in approximating farm work to work in *industry*. And with the technical saturation comes the need for a better educational and technical levels, for the specialised training which in the long run will enable the farmer to take his place with the townsman in the common ranks of the workers in communist production.

Nowadays it is the mechanic, the man operating the complex machines on the collective farm fields, who is the main figure. At the end of 1969 the number of these machine operators had grown to 2 million compared with 750,000 in 1935.

The same growth goes for specialists—men and women with secondary and higher specialised education who in 1969 numbered 944,000.

Allocation of the share of the national income to which they are entitled can be taken as yet another measure of the erasing of the distinction between the industrial working class and the peasants. The manner of its distribution on the collective farms now takes the shape of a guaranteed cash remuneration similar to that in the state-owned industries. In addition to remuneration in cash and in kind based on work-day units, we observe an ever wider extension in the rural areas of state welfare: provision of nursery classes and kindergartens and village schools, health and cultural services generally paid for mostly by the state. Collective farmers like the workers in industry are now eligible for pensions.

And lastly, a word about the role of education in overcoming the cultural distinctions between town and countryside.

Socialism, having enabled the peasant to acquire an education, has greatly extended his cultural horizon, proof of which is the spending by collective farmers of much more money on newspapers, journals and books.

Between 1935 and 1969 the number of people with secondary and higher education per thousand of the rural population had increased twenty-fold. Rural libraries

now number 87,000 and their total of books and journals adds up to 544 million, which is a hundred times greater than was the case in pre-revolution Russia. To this should be added the 114,000 village clubs and recreational centres with 131,000 stationary and mobile cinema installations.

Each year in the countryside well over one million concerts and theatrical performances take place, attended by 200 million people. Something like 5 million take part in amateur art, while 12 million young people belong to sports and physical culture societies.

Electricity, radio and television enable rural residents to become better acquainted with urban culture. Modern means of transport and communications facilitate convergence of people of town and countryside. Cultural patronage by the town over the village is widely practised, and men of science, culture and sport keep villagers abreast of achievements in science and technology.

From what has been said it will be seen that, in line with the advance towards communism, the old-time distinctions between town and countryside are being steadily erased.

#### Erasing Essential Distinctions Between People of Mental and Manual Labour

While the antithesis between workers by hand and by brain is abolished under socialism, they still differ considerably in the matter of education. The distinctions, of course, are conditioned by the levels of development of the productive forces and by the technical saturation of the economy which still needs both manual labour—in which the bulk of the workers and peasants are engaged—and the brainwork of the researcher and the technician. The distinctions are due to the unequal levels of mechanisation of the various jobs, to say nothing about automation which, however, is still in its infancy. Generally speaking, manual labour does not require the same degree of education as mental work.

The very nature of brainwork provides the intellectual with better conditions for development, for a fuller application of his abilities than is the case with the manual labour of the worker and peasant. From this it follows that erasing the distinctions between people of mental and manual labour is basic to social equality and, by the same token, to equal conditions for the all-round development of each member of society.

And one of the ways to do this is to *educate and train more people from factory and field, to extend the ranks of the intelligentsia.*

Socialism, by abolishing the exploiting classes abolished also their monopoly of intellectual work and by doing so put an end to the antithesis between physical and mental labour; the working people now have wide access to education, culture and science with the result that tens of thousands have been trained and are now serving the country in every way. By the end of 1970, 6.8 million people with a higher education and just under 10 million with a specialised secondary education were employed in the national economy, compared with 136,000 and 54,000 respectively in 1913.

Under socialism and especially in view of the technological revolution and the spread of education among the working people, the role of the intelligentsia acquires a special importance. The anti-communists argue that an "aloofness" of the intelligentsia is needed to maintain a domination over the workers and the peasants. In their view, the intelligentsia holds first place in solving the vital social problems. They try to counterpose the intellectuals to the working class, and to sow doubts about the leading role of the working class in socialist society.

Yet it is only in the socialist state where the leading role belongs to the working class that the *best* conditions exist for training a numerically strong intelligentsia and for the fullest application of their abilities, and under communism the conditions will be more favourable still.

*Raising the cultural and technical levels of the workers and peasants* is another way of overcoming the distinctions between people of mental and manual labour.

This is important also from the standpoint of professional training and bringing it into line with the needs of modern production and with the advances in science and technology which now, more than ever before, enhance the significance of the intellectual and the creative aspects of labour. The technology of the day calls for knowledge of and acquaintance with the basis of production, of the complex of applied and theoretical sciences, for ability to react quickly and for first-hand acquaintance with production methods and know-how. The higher the educational and technical levels of the working people the greater is their interest in aesthetic

values, in making rational use of leisure and in more interesting ways of recreation.

*Steady scientific and technological progress* which changes the nature of work and makes it more intellectual and creative, is basic to erasing the essential distinctions between people of mental and manual labour. Technology is changing mental work as well, since monotonous and exhausting operations (such as calculation and collecting information, etc.) are now performed by "thinking machines".

This is not to suggest that technological progress automatically results in a higher cultural and technical level. Needed for this are an extended network of secondary and higher specialised schools, improvements in the system of professional and industrial training, raising the ideological and political levels of the working people so that their skills in production are complemented by general education, by their training in the social and natural sciences and by the knowledge acquired by them as engineers and technicians, agricultural specialists, in medicine and other specialised fields. In this undertaking much depends on the intellectuals on whom devolves the duty of transmitting their knowledge and their experience to the workers and peasants, training them for the difficult and complex work in the mechanised and automated production of the future.

It can be affirmed that the educational and technological levels of the workers and peasants are rising steadily. Thus, for the period from January 1959 to January 1967 the number of people with a secondary education rose, for industrial workers, from 45.1 to 59.4 per cent, and for collective farmers from 22.6 to 33 per cent. These figures show that due to the technological progress in industry and agriculture, manual work is, in growing measure, acquiring elements of mental work.

Increasingly, the working class in the Soviet Union is personified by those who operate and manage the complex technical processes, by those who study in technical schools and colleges and apply their knowledge in research, and actively participate in the everyday life of society. In point of fact large numbers of workers perform jobs usually done by engineers and can, therefore, be described as worker-intellectuals. Their numbers are growing in the countryside, too.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government spare no effort to ensure that the working people have the leisure needed to improve their knowledge and education.

#### **The Development of Nations and Their Rapprochement**

The building of communist society in the USSR signifies a new phase in the history of national relationships, features of which are *the steady development of the nations and their drawing together in a harmonious unity.*

Taking place in the Union republics are all-round expansion of their economies, growing inter-division of labour, development of their economic contacts. The economy of communism now taking shape calls for closer contacts between the various republics. Every step in the advance towards communism, accompanied by the growing contribution of each to the common cause of expanding the productive forces of the country, of effecting scientific and technological progress and raising living standards, brings the socialist nations closer together economically. This in turn facilitates the rise of more and newer industrial centres, the exploration and utilisation of hitherto untapped natural resources, the cultivation of virgin lands, the development of the outlying areas, and the growth of all types of transport and communications. And these developments result in closer contacts between the nations in all spheres, in exchanges of production experience and of achievements in material and cultural growth.

From the standpoint of the national composition of population, the trend in each of the republics is one of becoming increasingly multinational—proof of the steadily drawing together of the peoples of the USSR. In all the republics one sees people of different nationalities working together in brotherhood.

The common features of the culture, morals and way of life of the Soviet nations are becoming more distinct, thereby ensuring mutual confidence and friendship between them. Firmer still is their spiritual unity. Their socialist cultures are enriched in the process of their rapprochement. Developing, too, is the international culture common to all the Soviet nationalities who take over all that is best and enduring in human culture. The culture of each nation is enriched by works which are acquiring a universal, international char-

acter, and in this we discern the beginnings of a single future culture of communism.

In the process of drawing together the nations break out from the old seclusion and exclusiveness, break with the ancient customs and habits which still retard the moulding of the new man. We have in mind here particularly the remnants of the inequality of women still found in some of the non-Russian republics and the survivals of the tenacious feudal customs and relationships in family life.

While the drawing together is an objective, natural process, it is not a spontaneous one, nor does it come about of its own volition and certainly not without difficulties. The economic and cultural growth of the socialist nations and their increasing kinship are the outcome of conscious guidance by the Communist Party and the socialist state in the sphere of national relationships. By guiding and organising the economic, socio-political and cultural relationships of the various nations and combining the centralisation of life in all the republics within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with national statehood, with full rights for each republic and local initiative, the Party and the Government facilitate an all-inclusive integration based on socialist internationalism. This internationalism is by no means confined to the recognition of independence and equal rights for the nations. It presupposes the need for their union, mutual aid and combined efforts. Nor can it be reduced to a one-sided material, cultural and technological aid, for it signifies genuinely mutual aid and a common responsibility for the communist cause.

**Extension of Socialist Democracy—the Way to Public Self-rule**

In the course of the advance towards communism socialist democracy develops along the lines of: a) the growing role of the Soviets of Deputies of the Working People; b) enhancing the role and significance of the mass organisations; c) the growing role of the work collectives in developing socialist society. The purpose here is to involve the greatest number in the direct management of social affairs. The Party, Lenin wrote, must teach all working people "the art of administration, not from books, not from lectures or meetings but from practical experience".<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 426.

Democratic development is manifested most strikingly in the growing role of the Soviets. By their very nature the Soviets were, and remain, both government and non-government bodies, and with the development of socialism the social aspect comes increasingly to the fore. But above all the Soviets are precisely those bodies in which millions of people gain invaluable experience of state administration.

They are thoroughly democratic and representative. In the USSR they number 49,583 at varying levels with over 2 million deputies. What is more, in their overwhelming majority these deputies are not professional government or Party officials, being mostly industrial workers, collective farmers and intellectuals. The composition of the present Supreme Soviet of the USSR, for example, shows that of 1,517 Deputies, 481 are industrial workers, 282 are collective farmers, and 146 are workers in education, science, health and culture; 62 nations and nationalities are represented in the Supreme Soviet. Of the Deputies elected to the local Soviets in 1969, 35 per cent are workers and 29.3 per cent collective farmers, 44.6 per cent are women, and 54.9 per cent are non-Party people. Where in any other society is it possible to find such a broad and all-inclusive representation of the working people in the organs of power? Taking the postwar years alone, nearly 20 million people have passed through the school of management in the Soviets.

In addition to the elected deputies, large numbers of activists take part in the work of the Soviets. Many of these are members of the various standing committees, others function as unpaid officials, as voluntary inspectors and instructors. Some 40,000 people function as unpaid deputy chairmen of Executive Committees, while the numbers of voluntary inspectors and instructors are in the region of half a million. And the activists, excluding the elected deputies, reach the figure of 25 million.

As the 24th Party Congress noted, the CPSU seeks to heighten the role of Soviets in social development. To this end the powers of the local Soviets have been extended also in such an important field as co-ordinating, within the limits of their competence, the work of factories and economic organisations situated on their territory. Their material and financial resources have been enlarged and they are getting more trained personnel.

Greater control is exercised by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviets of the Union republics over the state of affairs in the key sectors of economic and cultural development and over the work of ministries and departments.

The Soviets, the 24th Party Congress resolution said, should "carry out their functions still more fully and exert an effective influence on the development of the economy and culture, on the improvement of the people's welfare: they should deal more persistently with matters relating to social community and other services and to public order".

Another aspect of the democratic growth is the *increased role now played by the mass organisations* and their much wider participation in matters of state. The trade unions with an overall membership of over 90 million are the largest of the numerous mass organisations. By virtue of their functions the unions enable the working people to gain considerable experience in the art of management. They draw the working people into the administration of production and the affairs of society, show concern for the improvement of the people's well-being and greater labour productivity, streamline the organisation of labour emulation, inculcate a communist attitude to labour. One of their basic tasks is to safeguard the legitimate interests of workers and all other working people, to improve their living and working conditions, to heighten control over the observance of labour legislation, the rules of labour protection and safety engineering, and to improve the conditions of cultural life, rest and leisure of working people. Also within their competence are the large numbers of cultural establishments, sanatoria, holiday homes, children's summer camps and sports facilities.

An extensive network of other social organisations under the guidance of the unions function as auxiliaries to the state in managing the economy and public and cultural life. One of these—which is also one of the more important forms of mass participation in industrial management—is the production conference, a body permanently operating in industry, transport and building. Over five million factory and office workers, technicians and engineers, members of scientific and technical societies, representatives of the management and of the Party and Komsomol organisations take part in the production conferences.

Other trade union auxiliaries include bodies functioning on a voluntary basis, such as design bureaux, groups engaged in economic analysis, technical standardisation, innovation, all of which play a not unimportant role in organising and managing production. The economic reform, accompanied as it is by the increased economic independence of the enterprises and by emphasis on incentives, has heightened the responsibility of the trade unions for plan fulfilment, technical improvement, invention and rationalisation, encouraging initiative at grass-roots levels, involving more people in management and in developing socialist emulation. Political education, improving work organisation and the system of payment, helping members to improve their skills, attention to their job safety and everyday life—all come within the competence of the trade unions.

An ever greater responsibility for state and socio-cultural functions is delegated to the mass organisations. The Komsomol, for example, the independent organisation of 28 million of young men and women, plays a big part in educating and training young people. The numerous people's universities—a recent development—are doing much for cultural education.

The government bodies foster in every way the initiative of the public in forming societies and associations which are assuming responsibility wholly or in part for state functions. The legal framework for their functioning is provided by the state which helps them in every way. Recent years have seen, for example, the founding of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalisers, the Union of Composers and the Pedagogical Society of the Russian Federation, and several societies for cultural relations with foreign countries, dedicated to peace throughout the world and to developing economic and cultural contacts with other countries.

Yet another instance of the democratic growth is the *enhanced role of work collectives*. The work collective is the basic unit of socialist society, a major field of stepping up the labour and social activity of working people. The new, socialist qualities of Soviet people and the relations of friendship and comradely mutual assistance take shape in this collective. "The responsibility of each to the collective and of the collective for each of its members," says the Report

of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress, "is an inalienable feature of the Soviet way of life." The system of guiding work collectives is being improved with the aim of attracting working people to direct participation in running industry and in social and cultural activities. Opportunities for this are provided by the economic reform which, in addition to extending the juridical rights of the work collective, makes provision for funds which the collective may use at its discretion. These funds, coming from the profits in excess of target and, consequently, from good results of the work, are earmarked not only for the purpose of developing production, but also for improving working and living conditions, for recreational facilities for the workers of the particular plant, for raising their general educational level and specialised training. Incentive policy has heightened the interest of the work collectives in increased production, social and intellectual life of the workers, in higher labour productivity and in rational utilisation of both working time and free time.

Lively debates are under way in the socialist world on such subjects as industrial democracy, what it implies and what place it occupies in the overall system of socialist democracy. Attempts have been made, invoking both theory and practice, to reduce socialist democracy to industrial democracy. We have in mind here the so-called socialist "self-management" with the main role played by the particular collective and, arising from this, we are offered a revised version of socialist ownership: the enterprise becomes the economic subject of society operating through self-management in conditions of "a free and full unfolding of commodity-money relationships".

It is true, of course, that the enterprise and its employees are an economic and social unit in society, and participation by the workers in factory management is, as we have said, an important trend in the growth of socialist democracy. But to regard industrial or production democracy as an absolute would be tantamount to cutting off the work collective from the political organisation of society, from the state, and would turn the socialist society into a kind of conglomerate—the mechanical sum of the "self-managing" collectives. The entire issue of socialist democracy, including its economic, political and ideological aspects, is, in effect, confined to the

sphere of the economy and, what is more, is restricted to the collectives. In this case the collectives would be linked with one another chiefly through the mechanism of market relations, and with the state through the system of deductions from their profit.

Restricting democracy to the industrial collectives would signify ousting the producer from any part in the management of society, in state administration.

In this "self-managing" socialism the centralised, planned guidance of society—one of the greatest gains of socialism—is rejected; democracy is fitted in to the narrow frame of production. Economic effectiveness and the drive for profit become the sole motive of the collective, a factor of initiative which results in devaluing other motives—the ideological motives of human activity.

Consequently, in extending democracy within the work collective it is important constantly to bear in mind that *the collective is but one link in the economic and social system of socialism*, that its entire life and all its activity are designed to further the realisation of the overall aims of society.

The extension of socialist democracy is indissolubly linked with *the strengthening of legality and law and order, discipline and organisation*.

The laws of the Soviet socialist state are really humane. They guarantee the rights and freedoms of citizens and at the same time make it incumbent on them to define their duties, regulate their activities and their organisations in the interests of society as a whole and of each member individually. Unless democracy is accompanied by firm legality, law and order and discipline, it will turn into anarchy and disorder. On the other hand, unless law and order, discipline and compulsion are accompanied by democracy, they will degenerate into tyranny.

The Soviet state is bent on improving the socialist legislation and on strengthening law and order and discipline. In recent years the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has adopted with mass backing a series of new legislative enactments, including The Fundamentals on Marriage and the Family, The Fundamentals of Land Legislation, the Model Rules of the Collective Farm, The Fundamentals of Labour Legislation, and the Law on the Conservation of Nature. The 24th

Congress raised the question of drawing up a special law defining the status of deputies—from the Supreme to the township Soviets—and also the duties of officials with regard to deputies.

The laws and the ethical principles of socialism meet the interests of the whole of society and of each its member. That is why the Communist Party and the Government strongly combat breaches of law and of the principles of communist morality and constantly strengthen law and order and discipline. The 24th Party Congress resolution said in this context: "It is necessary to achieve a further strengthening of socialist legality; the work of the militia, the Procurator's Office and the courts must be improved. Party organisations, the trade unions and the Komsomol must secure the strictest observance of the law by all citizens and officials and raise the level of the legal education of the people. An improvement must be achieved in the work of the people's control and concern must be shown to have the Leninist ideas on constant and effective control by the broad masses unswervingly translated into life."

Lenin battled against every manifestation of anarchy and anarcho-syndicalism whose advocates envisaged socialism as a conglomerate of autonomous production communes. In the guise of independence and freedom, they opposed centralised management and planning. As Lenin saw things, the job of the working people was to manage society at all its links, not just within the narrow frame of one's own enterprise.

The democratic growth creates the conditions for a gradual devolution of state administration to the public administration of communism. But this in no way signifies any, even the slightest, belittling of the role played by the socialist state. On the contrary, its significance grows in the course of the advance to communism.

Communism is the result of the conscious efforts of the people, of their selfless labour and struggle. But it is necessary to combine these efforts and to channel them in the direction of a single aim and secure its realisation. Guided by the Party the socialist state is that force which organises the building of the new society. Hence the necessity for the socialist state to grow and perfect itself throughout the entire period of the advance to communism.

### 3. Moulding the New Man

We envisage the new man of the future society of communism as *an all-round, harmoniously developed personality*. We see him above all as a highly educated worker with a good grounding in science, as the creator of material values. He will be an active figure in public life, playing his part in managing the affairs of society, a man with a scientific world outlook, acquainted with art and literature and capable of creating not only material but also cultural values, a man of lofty ethical principles and of physical perfection. But these qualities do not come of themselves, they are moulded and inculcated.

#### The Need for Communist Education

The adversaries of communism, seeking to blacken its noble ideals, declare that it is powerless to wean man from the prejudices of the past. They admit that communism might be able to develop a powerful technology, and that it might succeed in creating abundance, but, they go on, with man being prone to evil, with it being part of his nature, you will never change human nature and never rid man of his greed, of his superstition and fears.

The actual reality of socialism, however, is little to the liking of the spiritual fathers of capitalism, it is not their business. Yet this reality proclaims loudly and clearly that this new man is on the way, that with the growth of the socialist economy and the new social relationships the man of socialism develops his intellect, his ethical and physical qualities and, step by step, casts overboard the ballast of class society.

The everyday public life of socialism, active participation in the building of communism, in planned organised work, in developing the new social relationships both in production and in day-to-day life—all play their part in the moulding of communist consciousness.

Being a component of the advance towards communism, this consciousness acts reciprocally. And this is understandable, for far from being some kind of mushroom growth communism is the end result of conscious and purposeful activity by the working people and, naturally, the greater the consciousness the more successful and the speedier will be the advance. The objective basis for moulding the new man and

for cultivating his communist consciousness is found in developing the economy and in the communist labour, social relationships and culture. These conditions, however, will not automatically ensure the triumph of communist principles and ideas. And from this standpoint the communist education of the people and ideological work are essential.

*Communist education* is education of all the working people in the spirit of lofty ideals and devotion to the communist cause, of a communist attitude to work and to the socialised economy; it means complete elimination of the vestiges of bourgeois views and habits, all-round, harmonious development of the individual and the creation of a wealth of spiritual culture.

#### Means of Communist Education

The years of Soviet rule in the USSR have seen the rise of an effective system of education which includes family and school, specialised secondary and higher establishments, the system of Party education, the press, radio and television.

Take, for example, *the family*. In fulfilling its vital social functions the family, in addition to reproducing human kind, rears the new generation. And it is in the family surroundings that the organism of the child, its spiritual world, relationship to environment, its behaviour and its actions are shaped. It is here that our young citizen first encounters the elementary principles of everyday life, becomes aware of the difference between good and evil, and learns how to do good and how to avoid evil.

Then comes the *school* which, equipping the pupil with knowledge, shapes his outlook on life, his ethical make up and, providing him with a broad polytechnical education, prepares him for socially useful work. Parents and school bring out and develop the abilities of young people, their minds and their thinking and help them to choose a path in life.

Of great value is higher education, with its vast experience in training specialists equipped not just with knowledge of their professions but also with the scientific, Marxist-Leninist outlook, people who in addition to being well educated are themselves excellent educators, capable of furthering the communist training of the new man.

*The system of Party education* is a genuinely Marxist-

Leninist university for millions. Here both Party and non-Party people study the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the Programme of the CPSU, decisions of its congresses and other important Party documents; moreover, assimilation of theory is combined with study of economic questions and closely linked with the concrete practical tasks confronting industry, the collective and state farms. This method brings the political study much closer to life, making it more purposeful and fruitful.

But of all the teachers the best is the *work collective*, whether in factory, office or farm. Every able-bodied citizen, being obliged to work, belongs to a particular work collective. And it is through the collective that the individual is most closely associated with all aspects of the life of society. Here he mixes with others, with the result that he develops both as specialist and as worker; here his mental world is enriched and he makes acquaintance with the ethical life of society—its collectivism, the feeling of comradeship, conscious discipline and a sense of responsibility for the work allotted to him.

#### Shaping the Scientific World Outlook

*The scientific, Marxist-Leninist world outlook* is an integral system of views on the world—nature, society, the laws of their development, the manner of cognising them and their reconstruction.

Already under socialism the scientific world outlook becomes the dominant outlook, the property of large numbers of the advanced and the more conscious part of society. Then in the advance to communism this world outlook is acquired by *all working people* without exception.

Nor can it be otherwise, for solving the complex tasks associated with the building of communism calls for people with a high level of consciousness, conversant with the laws governing the development of society, well informed about home and international affairs, with a clear understanding of the tasks confronting the country, and themselves taking an active part of fulfilling them. Mastery of this world outlook is insistently demanded by scientific and technological progress, by the rapid development of the natural sciences, which necessitates not only a profound philosophical thinking, but also a broad philosophical training for natural science workers. And lastly, the scientific world outlook

is a keen ideological weapon in combating the idealist and religious outlook, in combating the enemies of communism.

This outlook *derives from Marxism-Leninism as an integral system of philosophical, economic and socio-political views*. It follows, then, that in order to assimilate this world outlook it is essential to master the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, and not only to master them but creatively to apply them in everyday work.

In the shaping of this world outlook, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, that is, *dialectical and historical materialism*, is decisive. Marxist philosophy equips man with the scientific method that enables him to apprehend all the various phenomena encountered in nature and in social life, correctly to assess the events taking place around him, and to take his stand in solving the tasks confronting society. Philosophy teaches him to act and inspires him with confidence in the possibility of cognising the world and remaking it.

Mastery of the scientific world outlook signifies mastery also of *Marxist-Leninist economic theory*. By its discovery of the laws of motion in the decisive sphere of human activity—that of material production—this theory enables man to organise economic life and to reconstruct in his own interest all the multiform social relationships. Invaluable to man in his everyday life is the *theory of scientific communism* which in addition to opening up the prospect of a bright future, shows him how this future can be realised.

*The basic achievements of the natural sciences*, an essential element of the scientific world outlook, disclose to man the laws governing developments in nature and enable him to put under his control the natural processes, to make use of the vast natural resources. Thus, the scientific world outlook signifies both mastery of the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory and mastery of the natural sciences. Only in the unity and indissoluble interconnection of Marxism-Leninism and the natural sciences do we find a coherent system of scientific views on reality.

Combating Bourgeois Ideology The scientific world outlook and equally communist education as a whole presuppose *struggle against bourgeois ideology*. Having met with defeat in the political struggle, including armed struggle, imperialism, now gambl-

ing on a combat in the sphere of ideology, has launched an offensive against the ideological positions of socialism. To preserve the capitalist system and to embellish it, to keep the working people in subjection to bourgeois ideas and simultaneously to blacken socialism, to refute Marxism-Leninism, to sow doubts about communism, about the policy of the socialist countries—such are the objectives of the ideological offensive presently prosecuted by the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The theorists of imperialism are whetting their ideological knives, masking and covering up their paucity of ideas with a view to winning the masses, to diverting them from communist ideas. Fewer and fewer people nowadays pay heed to propaganda about “people’s capitalism”, about the “welfare state” which, they are told, had completely transformed capitalism. Because of this disbelief they are now treated to new concepts among which we find the theory of the “industrial society”. If we are to believe this theory, the old capitalism, having disappeared, has been replaced by the “industrial society” in which there are no class antagonisms; true, something is said about technological advance, but not a word about the character of the social relationships or the forms of ownership. In reality the progress of technology, its utilisation and the degree to which it serves the people are determined, as we have seen, by the nature of the social system, and for this reason the technological advance in capitalist society becomes a source of super-profit for a handful of monopolists and the source of impoverishment for millions of working people.

The imperialist theorists and politicians see one of their main task in transferring the ideological struggle directly to the territory of socialism, to influence the thinking of people, to instil in them ideas and principles alien to socialism and its way of life, utilising for this purpose the more backward elements in society.

This explains why communist education of the working people envisages irreconcilable struggle against the ideology of reactionary imperialism. And any let-up in the fight against this ideology would signify a weakening of the position of the socialist ideology, would be detrimental to the building of communism and to the moulding of the new man.

## Education Through Work

Assimilation of the communist, scientific world outlook signifies, in addition to knowledge of the laws of socio-economic development, the ability to use them in the practical remaking of nature and society, for the purpose of ensuring steady social progress and the triumph of communism. The social reconstruction and the triumph of communism are realised only in the process of man's working activity, in the process of *enthroning communist labour*, which explains why education through labour and a communist attitude to it are vital to the moulding of the new man. What is more, education through labour is at the very heart of the education of communism, since all the intellectual, moral and aesthetic qualities of man come to the fore through work. Progress in production, technology, culture and also in man's own development is unthinkable without work.

The main thing in this education is to inculcate respect for every kind of socially useful labour, both physical and mental, to do away with any high and mighty looking down on manual work, do away also with the philistine attitude to brainwork as some kind of easy and idle occupation. The highway to overcoming the essential distinctions between people, to changing the nature of work and inculcating a communist attitude to it, and to the moulding of the new man, is reached through the convergence of mental and manual labour.

Much is said nowadays about the atomic age with the emphasis not on the future of production but on the worker whose role, it is said, will be that of simply pressing a button. But no automation can replace the skills and professions in which are expressed all the warmth of heart and all the delicacy of artistic taste. In the long run the matter is not in the skills and professions as such, but in the attitude to work, to the professions and to professional skill. That is why in education, and especially in educating the rising generation, the emphasis should be not so much on what to be, but rather on *how to be*.

As everybody knows there is no such thing as a profession without any opportunity for creative endeavour, for thinking, and for improvement. The important thing is not just to train man to become proficient in a particular trade or profession, which in any case is not a very difficult matter,

what does matter is that he should so master his trade or profession that he will be able to create of his own choice, to work with a will.

## Ethical Education

*Inculcation of the communist ethic* is another aspect of communist education. Implied here is not simply abiding by communist morals, by their basic demands and principles, but (and this is the main thing) that in the process of moulding the behaviour of man, his habits, tastes and his character should correspond to these principles. Ethical education is a vital component of the education of communism. Consolidation of the communist morals and voluntary observance of the rules of communist way of life enter into the shaping of the new man.

The ethic of communism is set forth in the *moral code of its builders*, formulated in the Programme of the CPSU. This code boils down to those basic principles designed to guide man in building the new society of communism.

Communist morals are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the working class, to the aim of rounding-off the building of communism. From this standpoint ethical is that attitude which furthers the advance towards communism, while anything that impedes the advance is regarded as being unethical and amoral. The fight for the new society is, therefore, not simply the basic aim of communist morality, it is also the criterion for any ethical assessment, a criterion at once eminently scientific and objective, since it expresses the objective trend in man's development. The scientific aspect of the communist ethic is seen also in that its theoretical basis is Marxism-Leninism, the sole scientific world outlook.

Pointing to the content of the communist ethic and summing up the ethical progress of mankind and especially the outstanding features displayed by people in the actual process of building socialism and communism, the moral code enumerates the following fundamental ethical principles:

devotion to the communist cause; love of the socialist motherland and of the other socialist countries; conscientious labour for the good of society—he who does not work, neither shall he eat;

concern on the part of everyone for the preservation and growth of public wealth;

a high sense of public duty; intolerance of actions harmful to the public interest;

collectivism and comradesly mutual assistance; one for all and all for one;

humane relations and mutual respect between individuals—man is to man a friend, comrade and brother;

honesty and truthfulness, moral purity, modesty and unpretentiousness in social and personal life;

mutual respect in the family, and concern for the upbringing of children;

an uncompromising attitude to injustice, parasitism, dishonesty, careerism and money-grubbing;

friendship and brotherhood among all peoples of the USSR; intolerance of national and racial hatred;

an uncompromising attitude to the enemies of communism, peace and the freedom of nations;

fraternal solidarity with the working people of all countries, and with all peoples.

With the triumph of socialism in the USSR communist ethics have taken deep root in the life of society. However, in the minds of some and in their attitudes we still meet with left-overs of capitalism. We still encounter idlers who steer clear of socially useful labour and who live the life of scroungers, we have our money-grubbers, the egoists and the bureaucrats who, acting to the detriment of the public interest, place their own "I" above everything; and we still have those who squander public money, who violate labour discipline and disturb the peace.

These left-overs act as a hindrance to the building of communism. Those so infected violate the normal work and leisure of people, encroach on public property and on the property of citizens and bring discord into family life. Moreover, these relics of the past are, as a rule, exceedingly tenacious; never disappearing of their own volition, they remain in the minds of people long after the social conditions which engendered them have disappeared. It follows, then, that combating these hang-overs, combating manifestations of bourgeois morality and the private-property psychology is a component of the education of communism.

As the 24th Party Congress resolution pointed out, "public opinion must be more resolutely directed towards the struggle against violations of labour discipline, money-grubbing,

parasitism, embezzlement, bribe-taking and drunkenness. It is necessary to continue the struggle against all survivals of the past in the minds and actions of people. This requires the constant attention of the Party and of all politically-conscious forces in our society".

Decisive for overcoming this residue of negatives are *constructive labour*, active participation by all in building communism, diligent *study* and a steadfast raising of educational and cultural levels.

Human relationships are, as we know, exceedingly complex and varied. And while in socialist society these relationships are, in substance, relationships of unity, the unity does not preclude contradictions. At times relationships acquire a dramatic and even a tragic character, and they do so for a variety of reasons—material difficulties, indifference, cruelty, personal sorrow and, quite often, a sense of one's inadequacy. To bear in mind all the complexity of human relationships, the variety in human characters, destinies, insistently to root out all that is outdated, all that acts as a hindrance to the growth of man, to development, all that interferes with application of creative initiative, to fight for truth, for justice, to see the good in people, to find the way to the heart and mind of man—these are what we have in mind when we talk about inculcating the communist ethic.

Its inculcation is closely linked with the job of erecting the edifice of communism. For it is precisely active participation in this, in developing the communist beginnings in economic and political life, and under the influence exerted by the entire system of education that the shaping of this ethic takes place.

**Aesthetic Education** Aesthetic qualities, tastes and the ability to appreciate and to create the beautiful in art, in life and to construct life in harmony with the laws of beauty—these are the indispensable elements of man's all-round development.

Man comes into the world endowed with aesthetic feeling, with a disposition towards art, and both the feeling and the disposition need cultivating.

*Aesthetic education* is in the first place the cultivation of artistic feeling. This is not to say that the aesthetics is free from intellectual approach. It is always intellectual, but the

significance of the emotional in it is very great indeed and it is precisely the emotional aspect that renders it attractive and conducive to that profound ideological and intellectual content found in all genuine art. Aesthetic education, then, is training of the mind and of feelings, of the mind through feelings. Especially great is the role of aesthetics in socialist society which provides the people with the opportunity to create artistic values and to enjoy them. And the nearer we get to communism the greater will be the role of aesthetics, of art and literature.

Aesthetic taste, based on the scientific world outlook and imbued with a lofty ideology, uplifts man, enriches him, makes his life interesting and conditions his emotional attitude to life. It enables him to perceive the beautiful, to assert this beauty in work and in life, to appreciate the truth in works of art and not only to enjoy them but also to create them. Inculcation of aesthetic habits and tastes is all the more necessary because they enable man to make beautiful objects and things without which life and human development are unthinkable. In making higher aesthetic demands on the products of labour, people are called upon at the same time to realise these demands in their work, and this can be done only by acquiring aesthetic habits and tastes. Thus, habit and taste are needed not only by the artist who makes the particular objects of art but also by all who create material values.

*Art*, then, has a big part to play in inculcating aesthetic taste and its influence on man will be all the greater the more brilliant the art and the more its ideological content harmonises with the finished art form. Only a genuine artist can be a teacher of artistic taste, that is an artist who is the enemy of ideological inanity and of the apolitical, of the drab and the mediocre, of schematism and poverty of image and literary language.

The acquisition by each member of society of ability to create objects of art by no means signifies the end of art, its dissolving in the other varieties of human activity. As a specific form of human activity, as a vital means of aesthetic education art will remain with us under communism. The same, evidently, will hold true of specialisation in one or another kind of artistic work. Obviously, not everybody will be a Raphael or a Tchaikovsky or a Pushkin, but, as

Marx put it, "he who has the making of a Raphael in him shall be given the opportunity for free and unhindered development".

Under communism man will not be burdened with the material worries which so often take up so much of his time. All his needs will be fully satisfied. A tremendous growth of culture will take place and, consequently, also the opportunities to make full use of its achievements. Spiritual needs and interests will be greatly enlarged and, equally, the opportunities for their satisfaction. Growth of production, science and technology will considerably shorten the working day and increase leisure, thus enabling people to devote themselves when they so desire to artistic work.

**Physical Improvement** Moulding the new man is unthinkable without his *physical improvement*. The physically complete man is first of all a healthy man. Health in mind and body is, as we know, the necessary condition for work and for participation in public life. Only the healthy man is in possession of all the variety of human attributes, the ability to work, to enjoy nature, creative labour and emotionally to take in his surroundings. But the physically perfect individual is something more than just a healthy man. He is a man who is in control of his body, of his muscles, a man of splendid physique brimming over with the joy of life, vigorous and energetic.

Sometimes it is said that one should not bother about physical perfection, since under communism there will be no such thing as physical labour. But (and we have referred to this previously) labour will never become a kind of game or recreation, it will always require a certain amount of human effort both mental and physical. Managing the complex technology will call for exceptionally quick reactions, concentration and the ability to make swift decisions which while not excluding muscular effort as such signify nevertheless transferring the effort from the muscles in the direction of nervous strain. And for this reason physical fitness is a must.

Physical training, physical culture and sport are effective means of bodily improvement. Regular exercise and participation in sport are good body-builders and compensate for inadequate movement, especially for those in sedentary occupations.

The sportsman with his bodily fitness stands out among his fellows, attracts their attention and awakens in them the desire to follow his example.

Sport, of course, is unthinkable without records, without banners, competitions and meetings of sportsmen. In the Soviet Union, however, it is not records that take pride of place but the involvement of millions in physical culture and, in the long run, of all members of society. Genuinely mass participation is the feature of the Soviet system of physical training.

The two hundred thousand odd Soviet sports societies have an overall membership of 50 million. Sport has a big following in schools and colleges. The idea is to ensure that physical culture and sport reach out to and embrace all, that they become part of everyday life. This complex of physical training, spiritual and ethical qualities points the way to perfecting the individual and to his all-round development.

The moulding of this harmoniously developed man is the supreme aim and the mission of communism. Communism is created by the people and for the people. This is its strength and the guarantee of its coming triumph.

#### 4. Communism—Man's Future

Marx and Engels, renowned leaders of the working class, were the founders of the theory of scientific communism. Their profound analysis of capitalist society, their study of the struggle of the working people against exploitation enabled them to draw the conclusion that capitalism would have to give way to socialism, to a society without exploitation and oppression. They discovered the means for the overthrow of capitalism—the class struggle and the socialist revolution, and they pointed to the social force capable of abolishing capitalism and building socialism—the working class.

Lenin, the brilliant leader of the Russian and international working class, developed the theory of scientific communism in the new historical conditions, in the era of imperialism, which he described as the eve of the socialist revolution. Lenin demonstrated the possibility of the victory of socialism at first in one or in a number of countries. He

founded a new type of party, the revolutionary party of the working class, which became the organiser and leader of the industrial proletariat and of all working people in the fight against capitalism, for the triumph of socialism. Lenin was the leader of the October Socialist Revolution, the first victorious revolution of the working class. The victory in October 1917 ushered in a new era in history, the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism. With this victory the world was divided into two social systems—capitalism and socialism. With this victory socialism was no longer a matter of theory, it became in addition a matter of practice, of action and construction.

Traversing unexplored pathways and encountering incredible difficulties, the Soviet working class in alliance with the working peasantry and headed by the Communist Party completed the building of socialism and is now advancing towards communism. In the course of this grand endeavour valuable experience was acquired and the general laws governing the building of socialism were discovered. Chief among these general laws are the socialist revolution in one or another form; the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the Communist Party in society; socialist reconstruction of the economy and culture. These general laws, manifested in specific ways in each country, find their confirmation in the building of the new society in the countries of the socialist world system.

As a social system socialism has existed for half a century—an exceedingly brief space of time when measured against the long history of mankind. But in this brief period it has demonstrated its obvious superiority over capitalism, and has solved a whole number of problems over whose solution man had dreamed for centuries. It abolished the exploitation of man by man, awakened to making history vast masses of working people and made them the masters of society, the makers and the consumers of all material and spiritual values. Socialism has placed at man's disposal the achievements of industry, science and culture, has found a just solution to the national and peasant questions and has introduced a new principle into international relationships—the principle of peaceful co-existence.

Grand indeed are the achievements of socialism; recognised all over the world they cannot be ignored even by its

opponents. And what is more, the prospects that will be opened up by communism—the second and higher phase of the new society—are boundless. For the peoples of the world communism signifies eternal Peace; it will forever rid man of fear for his future and the future of his children. Communism proclaims on earth the kingdom of Labour, makes labour free and creative for all, transforms it into a prime necessity, a source of joy and inspiration. It marks the entry into the kingdom of Freedom, freedom for man as a worker, as a social being, as a builder and thinker with command over the forces of nature and the social processes. Communism ensures Equality and Brotherhood for all, since all will be people of labour working in the full measure of their abilities and, in the same full measure, will be able to satisfy all their needs, the rational and healthy needs of the man of all-round development. Man becomes the friend of man, a comrade and a brother. Communism brings genuine Happiness to all people, the happiness of confidence in a grand future, the joy of creative labour, labour of the greatest benefit to society and to man himself, and the boundless opportunity to perfect his mental and physical qualities.

It will be seen, then, that communism corresponds to the cherished interests and desires of the peoples, it proclaims itself a genuinely humanist, the most humane of social systems. This explains why it is winning the hearts and the minds of more and more millions of people, why it is being reinforced by ever-growing numbers of supporters and fighters in the different parts of the world. In this we see the strength of communism, the vital factor of its triumph throughout the world.

Communism, however, does not come of its own volition. The way ahead, doubtlessly, will be hard and long, taking a toll of not a few lives. But the sacrifice and the losses will not be in vain. In the last century communism was described as a spectre haunting Europe. In our day it is a real society, taking shape over the vast expanses of Europe, Asia and Latin America. The road to socialism and communism has been taken by many nations and states and, sooner or later, it will be taken by all nations and states.

*Communism is the bright future of all mankind.*

#### REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

